CENTURY
AND AFTER

1877  1930

Founded by JAMES KNOWLES

1930 **JANUARY**

LONDON: CONSTABLE & CO. LTD., ORANGE STREET, LEICESTER SQUARE, W.C.

PARIS: [illegible] HACHETTE, 111, Rue Réaumur. NEW YORK: Leonard Scott Publication [illegible]

[illegible] for Canadian Magazine Post.

[illegible] Annual Subscription [illegible] (Prepaid). [illegible]

THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER

XIX- -XX

A MONTHLY REVIEW

FOUNDED BY JAMES KNOWLES

VOL. CVII

JANUARY—JUNE 1930

LONDON
CONSTABLE & COMPANY LIMITED 10 & 12 ORANGE STREET
LEICESTER SQUARE W.C. 2

CONTENTS OF VOL. CVII

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER



No. DCXXXV—January 1930

AN EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

I. The Need for Inquiry

Education in this country would have a better chance with the general public if we could escape from the word. Its ugly portentousness puts people off. Everyone who has had to write or speak on education knows the kind of misgiving that comes upon him as he approaches his subject. He knows that the very word will give check to the ordinary man and woman—certainly to the ordinary Englishman. It produces in him not so much active dislike as sheer aloofness. This is not for me, he thinks, and turns away. Thus educational discussion becomes rather a thankless business. This thanklessness is assisted by the repulsive character of the technical or professional vocabulary of education, which seems to eliminate everything that has life or soul. Pedagogy; usher; school-places; elementary, primary, higher-grade, central and secondary schools; grant-earning schools; aided schools; curriculum; matriculation; school

certificates; 'higher schools,' 'general schools' [illegible] examinations), educationist, and all the rest of this [illegible]. Is it strange that everyone but the enthusiast and the [illegible] passes by on the other side when he hears such language being used? All the more does he try not to listen for its being constantly in his ears. No people talk so much or so often about their own business as the professional teacher and the educationist. (This may seem a false dichotomy: logically, yes; but not in practice. The two may coincide, but need not.) From the august periods of the Headmasters' Conference to the lively conversation of the National Union of Teachers educational talk is always in our ears and before our eyes. It does not interest the world at all. Not that men and women of the world take actually no interest in all that the word 'education' is meant to cover—they are interested in children and human nature—but what concern for education they have is blunted altogether by the aspects of it presented to them. They do not care enough to try to get behind the setting that disgusts them and remain ignorant of almost all that is done in the educational way. Start after dinner some educational subject, and at any ordinary table it will fall dead flat. Ask anyone what is a secondary school, and it is ten to one he will not be able to tell you; it has been taken to mean a second-rate school. They *have* heard of board schools, which they continue to describe by that name, school boards having come to an end over twenty years ago. There is no encouragement to 'take up' education. Nobody will take much interest in your work or your hobby if you do.

Education, it must be admitted, is not a good 'line' for the ambitious person: it leads to little—an amazing conclusion, in view of the content of education rightly understood. It is significant that no aspiring politician of outstanding ability has ever chosen Education as his portfolio. He has not seen in it many possibilities. Mr. Churchill, who has nearly completed the *cursus honorum*, omitted the Board of Education. The Board of Education is regarded politically as one of the minor jobs. Yet what might not have been the prestige of a public man who, taking the Education Department, set himself to the work of abolishing once for all large classes? It would be, of course, an immense undertaking; it would mean a struggle with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and with the counties and county boroughs; the Minister might be overruled and go under. But the risk would be worth taking. That large classes could be got rid of, given the will, no one intimate with educational administration will doubt. It could not be done in a day, of course, but it could be secured that after comparatively few years there should be no class, say, of over twenty-five children. The

[illegible] with effectively. Everybody knows that in [illegible] classes as large as are very many now, there can be no [illegible] of the children affected. The teacher is faced with an impossibility. The expense would be enormous; the increase in buildings and teachers would be alarming to the country; but the case could be made out. If it is worth while having compulsory education at all, it must be worth while to make it effective. To that there is no possible answer. The public could be made to see it; and the Government or the man who carried it through would never be forgotten. But such a Government or Minister will not arise. No one is going to take risks for education. Mr. Fisher preferred to abandon compulsory continuation schools—his own child—to resigning. Mr. Lloyd George would not face immediate unpopularity for the sake of a great constructive reform. Evidently education cannot count on any sort of devotion amongst public men. Is it strange, then, that the public take no lively interest in it? They allow much to be done and much to be spent, but their interest is nearly exhausted in a grumble. We all know the squire—maybe now comparatively rare, though probably it is rather that he keeps his views more to himself—who thinks educating the working classes all a mistake; who challenges you to show that they are either happier or better for it; who assures you that the best man he has by some good luck never learnt to read; that it is education that makes it so difficult to get maidservants; that we have been going down the hill all the time we have been spending so much on schools.

But did you not go to Winchester yourself? someone says. He has to admit that he did; but offers the excuse or set-off that he learnt very little at school—the good he did get was from games, and not in the study.

This attitude is not simply to be despised: there is something in it which has to be met. The good squire never comes across the real things in education that would appeal to him: he sees only its machinery.

A more numerous type than our squire is the man who is not reactionary—who recognises the need for a certain amount of education, but cannot see that in fact it has done much good; if education is good for the masses, he can only say that at present it must be on wrong lines. It is quite useless to meet this type by telling him, as Sir Charles Trevelyan did the other day, that 'we have evolved one of the best elementary school systems in the world.' Optimism, he would say, is easy. Show me the proof. No amount of statistics will impress this man.

It is not systems he is concerned about, but boys and girls—the boys and girls he employs in his office. Are we getting value for the money spent by the State on their education?

Then there is the largest group of all, which probably includes most of the middle and professional classes as well as a great many working people. These are friendly to education and acquiesce in its being compulsory; they do not mind 'spending a bit' on it, and would be willing to spend more if they were sure it would bring more results. But they are not sure; they have doubts whether the country is getting full value for its education money. They would not say that the elementary boy and girl of to-day show no advance on the boy and girl of twenty years ago, but they do not show as much as might be expected. Especially in capacity to think for itself he finds the youth of to-day deficient; or, at least, not nearly so efficient as it ought to be. In short, he thinks the country ought to get a better and more finished 'article' for its money than it does. Unfortunately he does think and express himself in terms of manufacture, which discloses a conception of education certain to prevent him judging any educational problem justly. You cannot, happily, 'turn out' boys and girls from school as articles from a factory. But the fallacy is a natural one, in view of much that they hear, or hear of, from the professed educationist. Political speeches on education generally take a mechanical turn. The layman cannot find an answer in public speeches or official documents to the questions he is thinking of. He does not want details of machinery and methods. That is the expert's job. What he wants, in short, to know is, What are we aiming at in education? His mind might be stated in three questions: What is our port? Where are we? Whither are we tending? He wants a survey of the whole field. Able expositions of schemes and policy abound. The Board of Education is bursting with them; but the official can no more escape through the meshes of his office than the politician through the meshes of his party. Neither of them can independently survey the field. Neither public man nor official, were he convinced that compulsory education was a failure, dare say as much.

But that is just the general question on which the public want a considered view It may be all right, but we want to know where we are. What does it all come to? Either way, a survey that has the confidence of the lay public must do good. On the one hand, it might assure the layman that education was justifying itself—that he was getting, or certainly soon would get, value for his money. Or it might conclude that the layman's suspicions were borne out—that education had not had the effect that was hoped for and was on wrong lines. That would be a

[illegible]

Would there be any extraordinary difficulty in setting up an inquiry such as we have been contemplating? What is wanted is a small committee of laymen. There must be no educationist on it, no schoolmaster or schoolmistress, no university don, no director of education or education officer; no one connected with the Board of Education, either past or present; especially no ex-President, nor any other public man who has 'taken up' education. To gain the confidence of the public the committee must be absolutely lay, otherwise it would be suspect by large numbers on the look out for faddism and professional bias. Not altogether unreasonably. It is very difficult for even the best and ablest of men to get outside their work and see it from the outside point of view, but that is just the view wanted in this case. Men of affairs, cultivated men of the world, who have seen much of men and women, are wanted for this job. It should not be very difficult to find an ex-judge of wit and wisdom to act as chairman. There should be a sailor and a soldier—it is easy to think of good men for the work from both services. Then a commercial man and a banker (Walter Leaf would have been very suitable) and, perhaps, a great railway official (some ex-general manager), and, of course, one or two women (some great lady socially with brains and perhaps a welfare worker who knows young girls well)—all these would be wanted. A Labour member would, of course, be necessary. It might be left to the Trade Union Congress to nominate a man, on the strict condition that he was not professionally or publicly connected with education. Ecclesiastics present a difficulty. Many of them—including some bishops without sees—are especially suited to serve on such an inquiry, but they are all associated with education in a semi-professional way. Also, the public might not be confident that an ecclesiastical member could approach vexed questions of religious education without prejudice. It seems that the clergy—Anglican, Roman, or Nonconformist—could serve only as witnesses. The secretary would be appointed by the committee itself, or by the chairman under the same disability as to connexion with education.

In such a committee the average man and woman should have confidence. They would feel that this was a different matter from any of the departmental committees, who were always issuing reports they could not understand. These were plain men and women, however distinguished, with whom the man in the street could be in sympathy.

As for the reference, I should be taking myself much too seriously if I produced a detailed draft of the questions to be

submitted to the committee. No one who has read this article so far will find any great difficulty in imagining the sort of questions the committee would be concerned with. Roughly the inquiry would be occupied with these points: What are we aiming at? Where are we? Whither are we tending? It would be an inquiry into the realities of education—realities permanent and underlying all policy and all machinery, but seldom appearing in speeches or reports. The proposal, for instance, to raise the school age, which we will assume the committee approve, would interest the committee, not on the side of providing room enough and enough teachers, for they would know that such matters always settle themselves; but how, they would ask, are you going to produce and recruit teachers of a higher calibre than the average elementary teacher for your senior schools? Without this higher type of teacher it is useless to expect much from the new schools. Do the Board quite know what sort of teacher is wanted? At present they are providing for the necessary tale of teachers by asking the training colleges to take so many more students. That is to say, the extra teachers will be of the same type and trained in exactly the same way as the elementary teacher of to-day, whose inability to enable his older scholars to use their time to better advantage has prompted the new policy. The committee would not need to go into any details of organisation or finance. They would be concerned rather with that which organisation has to express and finance to enable.

Their fundamental aim would be to arrive at a right conception of the process of education. Varro's phrase (if he did say it), '*educat nutrix*,' is not a bad guide. Whatever he exactly meant, it is true that the nurse's care of, or at least duty to, her charge goes nearer to true education than most processes that pass under the name. It is a mistake, as well as etymologically incorrect, to suggest that education is concerned only with drawing out. Putting in is also an essential part of the process; but what you put in must be digested, that it may be transformed and reproduced as blood and muscle. Information swallowed and not digested does actual mischief, so far from being absorbed and then given out in the form of thought. Perhaps the best analogy is the gardener's care of a plant. The plant will grow on its own lines; all the gardener can do is to *assist* the plant by giving it right food in the form of soil and water and light; by general attention based on thoughtful observation. The gardener's function is not mechanical. He cannot *make* the plant do anything. Neither can the teacher make a child this thing or that. He can assist the child's development and give him sustenance that he can assimilate and convert into thought

on his own account. The true teacher will have his mind fixed, not on the child as he is, but on what he will be ten years after he has left school. What he does may by a figure be described as sowing seed. He will not look for fruit in the time for flower nor flower in the time for leaves. The nurseryman (the use of the word is significant) analogy has been severely criticised, but I doubt if our committee will be able to find a better. One may assume that the members of the committee would make a point of visiting representative training colleges, conferring in every case with the principal and staff and conversing with the students. These colleges are fed mainly from the secondary schools, which are perhaps the greatest constructive success the Board of Education has achieved. In the secondary schools—especially, I think, in the girls' schools—one is conscious of an atmosphere of great hopefulness. Yet how many of these training college students will our committee find possessed of any thoughtful conception of education, whether on the nurseryman analogy or any other? Assume that the students—men or women—of the college visited are of an exceptionally high quality. Beyond passing the examination necessary to qualify for their profession, will they take an intellectual interest in their work? Have they mental background? Are their interests intellectual? Can they or do they desire to study by themselves? Do they read books on their own account apart from examinations? They assiduously attend lectures, scrupulously, or slavishly, taking down the precise words of the lecturer. It is less hard work to take down what someone else says and learn it by heart than to think for yourself.

Unless this view of training college students on the intellectual side is wide of the truth—and I doubt if anybody familiar with these colleges will say it is—have we not here the explanation of most of the shortcomings complained of by the public in the results of compulsory education?

Is it strange that those who are without intellectual interest, who avoid thinking for themselves, who adopt any mechanical means of shirking thought, should be unable to stir intellectual interest in the boys and girls they teach in the elementary school? Can we expect children to try to think for themselves unless their teachers do? Is it not natural that they should prefer to swallow *en bloc* and commit to memory what the teacher tells them, and reproduce it, with great *éclat*, in examination time, to labouring to understand it and make it their own?

Naturally the teacher gets his pupils to do as he did—take down from him cut-and-dried information as he took it from the lecturer at college. Read (I speak from knowledge) the essays of the 'best' scholars. They are too often such as no child

could possibly write. Happily not! Flowery, stilted stuff without a spontaneous suggestion. The prize child copies his teacher instead of thinking. No able boy or girl could spend two years in the highest standard under such teaching without deteriorating. I remember asking a boy who had for a long while been doing the Napoleonic Wars as his 'period' in history to tell me of some man of mark of that time. His mind seemed to be a blank, and it was not until my colleagues and I had assisted him with suggestions that at last he said 'Napoleon.'

Why is history nearly always a weak subject with elementary boys and girls? They dislike it. I have asked many, but so far I have not come across more than two all told whose favourite subject was history. Why? It seems most unnatural. Of all things, one would have thought history—the exciting doings of men and women—could be easily commended to the child mind. There must be something wrong somewhere. I suspect that our committee would ask some questions about the number and variety of subjects taught in the schools, especially the secondary schools. Nearly all teachers agree that too many subjects are taught; but they plead the exigencies of examinations. Their pupils *must* be got through these examinations: they cannot help themselves. I feel greatly for the teachers; theirs is a very hard case. Our committee would do good service by tackling the whole question of examinations. It is difficult to get at the truth. Too many concerned in professional education are committed to the present system. Examinations are generally described as a necessary evil. Certainly, if Sir Charles Oman is right, it is a great evil at Oxford. In the *Quarterly Review* for January 1929 Sir Charles Oman says:

> Essentially speaking, the Oxford curriculum is planned purely with a view to success in examinations, not to the increase of learning. It fares ill with the undergraduate of good parts who swerves from the prescribed subjects and becomes attracted to studies which, as his tutor assures him, will not pay.

Do not blame the tutor: he has no choice. But on Sir Charles Oman's showing the examination element is plainly hurtful to Oxford education. Most teachers think the same of the first and second school examinations. I thought, when they were proposed, that these examinations, if set going, would dominate the secondary schools, and they have. Reading for its own sake becomes impossible.

There is another matter which would especially interest our committee, and on which their conclusions should be very valuable. Is a 'humane' or 'practical' education the better training for the world and for life? Is the university man

better or worse at business than other men? I remember a very interesting series of interviews with prominent men of business organised by the Education Committee of the London County Council. These men's views on education were not what, probably, most people would expect. I remember the general manager of a great railway saying he preferred men for his offices who had had a classical education. He particularly emphasised Greek. Generally they had little use for the teaching of 'business methods' or other 'practical' subjects. What they wanted was well-educated boys and girls. Give them that foundation, and they would have no difficulty in adding 'practical' knowledge.

One might hope that the committee would go deeply into the teacher problem. The teacher undoubtedly is the greatest factor in education next to the taught. It is a pity this is not more generally realised. In fact, most of us do not know very much of teachers: we are rather out of sympathy with them. We do not recognise their influence, which is greater morally and spiritually than intellectually. The elementary teacher is the only person who has touch with and knows the real mass of the people—the average boy and girl. He knows them simply because they are compelled to come before him. Where there is no compulsion you will find only a small sample. It is the clergyman's constant regret that he cannot get at the mass. The politician knows nothing of them. The trade union leader organises his men, but he does not know them face to face as the teacher knows his. Yet teachers are rather a class apart. Superior probably to most of those around them, they often lack the social recognition they consider their education warrants. Thus thrown back on themselves, teachers tend to live in a professional groove, which is bad for them and for education. Yet the teacher, if he could realise it, has the best of the argument. The possibilities in the faces he meets every day are infinite. What material can be compared with children? If teachers think they are not given their due place, as they are not, if they are often lonely, as they are, let them take heart—Christ himself did not refuse the title of teacher.

HAROLD HODGE.

AN EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

II. The Aim: An Educated Democracy

Human government can be no better in the end than human nature, and popular self-government will continue to be a difficult machine to work in practice, until the political education of the people has reached a very much higher level. The end of government is not merely good government, but the education of the people in good government, its self-education in running its own affairs. (General Smuts.)

. . . in that tradition of education which I have called English I feel that we have ready to our hand the instrument that can create the educated democracy, upon which the whole future depends. . . . (Dr. Cyril Norwood, *The English Tradition of Education.*)

It is easy to dream of an educated democracy. It is when one meets democracy in the streets, the picture palaces, the professional football grounds, that one realises the immensity of the task of raising the general level of its education. Yet Dr. Cyril Norwood believes that the instrument is ready to our hand. The English tradition of education—a tradition based upon religion, relying largely upon team games, with a many-sided intellectual appeal, purged of Puritanism, and 'inspired by the duty of preparing all for the service of their generation'—will achieve the task. All that is necessary, according to the headmaster of Harrow, is to implant the tradition firmly *in every type of school* (my italics), and the educated democracy will follow, as the day the night.

We need not quarrel with the tradition. It is altogether magnificent, altogether English. But where does it exist, outside a few favoured public schools? Where can it exist? Who is going to undertake the task of inculcating it elsewhere? A tradition based upon religion—while the endless dispute between secular and denominational schools lingers on interminably; relying largely upon team games—when only the smallest fraction of the public elementary schools has any decent facilities for organised games; with a many-sided intellectual appeal—with a school-leaving age for the vast majority of fourteen, shortly to be raised in the teeth of determined opposition to fifteen, just the age at which intellectual appeal may expect to receive the first fruits of response; purged of Puritanism—when

the finest elements among the masses of the people are essentially Puritan, and 'inspired by the duty of preparing all for the service of their generation '—when the task of preparing all to earn their daily bread and butter is almost beyond the capacity of the overburdened and overdriven elementary school teacher. Yes, it is a magnificent tradition, and altogether English; it has its roots deep in our rough island story—but in present circumstances it has no connexion whatever with the great majority of the English people.

There always have been, and in pessimistic moments I am inclined to believe there always will be, two English nations. There certainly are to-day; they live apart from each other, are educated differently, think differently, are, in fact, complete strangers to each other. Each respects and admires the other, up to a point and at a distance. It is not impossible to pass from one nation to the other, but it takes at least two generations to make the transition with any completeness. Not until the educational needs of *both* these two nations are fully met shall we have an educated democracy in England. For centuries the one nation has fed, clothed, educated (or neglected to educate), governed and *thought for* the other—done everything for it, in short, except recognise it on equal terms. Now at last the other nation, that is, the great mass of the people, is struggling to achieve equality, and is being met with every kind of assistance likely to baffle its efforts, simply because the ruling or privileged classes are quite incapable of thinking in terms of any life other than their own, and consequently, whenever they venture outside that life, are either insulting (quite unconsciously, and with the utmost politeness) or utterly ludicrous.

To turn specifically to education. The one nation decided long ago the education it desired for its children, and it perverted the public schools (originally founded in most cases, it will be remembered, for *poor* scholars) to make them serve its purpose; and well indeed they have served it. The English public school boy, with all his faults, is undoubtedly the finest type of gentleman on earth, and it is not his fault if he knows nothing of life outside his own immediate circle. The English public school, with all its faults, is probably the healthiest, and often the most beautiful, environment in which a boy could spend his years of adolescence. And what of the English elementary school and its slightly more favoured brother, the English secondary school? Pause for a moment to consider this contribution of the privileged classes for the benefit of the unprivileged; for the elementary school and the secondary school have been designed, financed, and controlled throughout almost exclusively by the privileged, by those who have never entered their doors either as pupils or

as teachers, by those who, inspired by the duty of service to their generation, have never understood the generation they have served.

The English elementary school career begins at five—that is, at least three years too late. We are still talking in this country of the provision of nursery schools; and while we talk the infants play in the gutter (having nowhere else to play) and the fittest survive. The others contract all the diseases which modern civilisation has to offer; and anyone who has watched the children of the poor being carried through the streets to the infirmary in the early hours of the morning can testify how loathsome those are. The English elementary school career ends at fourteen; at an age when the public school career is just beginning. During those nine years—or at least during the first seven of them, for the English elementary school has never quite acquired the technique of teaching children over twelve—the child is as well taught as the circumstances permit. And what are those circumstances? Horrible overcrowding, incredibly large classes, almost complete lack of clean air, the meagrest provision of material, insufficiently educated and trained teachers, and regimentation from above persistent and depressing enough to chill the enthusiasm of the bravest idealist. What chance is there for our ancient tradition of education to flourish in such places? And this provision is considered good enough for the children of the masses; we are, in fact, rather proud of our elementary school system. I have heard it described as the best in the world. God help the rest, if that be true. What there is of good in it, and there is much that is good in it, is due entirely to the amazing courage and determination of those who have in their work triumphed over circumstances.

We now provide secondary schools for a few of the children who begin their career in the elementary school. A competitive examination of the utmost ferocity guards entry to these schools, and through its narrow meshes creep the super-industrious, the super-coached, and the lucky ones with the examination flair. On the rest the door of opportunity shuts for ever, unless the parents are prepared and able to pay a sort of income tax called fees. Then—strange illustration of English justice—the child will be admitted almost irrespective of the quality and quantity of his intelligence, and educated at a cost to his parents of about one-third what his education costs the school. Our secondary schools are full of these parasites; and nobody seems to mind.

The English secondary school, knowing no better, has throughout its short career set itself to play the sedulous ape to the public school. It has set out to rival it in intellectual achievement, in athletic prowess, in organisation; it is even the main ambition of

many a secondary school to be called a public school, an ambition it can realise by getting its headmaster on to what is called the Headmasters' Conference—not that the school is one whit the better for the title or is any more a public school. This attempt on the part of the English secondary school to ape the existing aristocracy is one of the most serious minor tragedies of English education to-day, for it has been provocative of more airs without graces than any other cause. Had the English secondary school in 1902 seriously faced the problem of providing higher education for the children of the masses of the people, had it realised that it was up against an entirely new set of circumstances, and struck out boldly on lines fit to meet those circumstances instead of almost slavishly copying a system that had worked well enough in other but totally different circumstances, then the tale of 1930 would have been a very different and a much happier one. Some time ago I wrote about the secondary school boy an article[1] in which I professed my admiration of and belief in him. I now admire and believe in him still more, for I appreciate more deeply his desperately adverse circumstances. He has in the main fought a good fight, and if he has gone under or failed of his ambition, the fault has been in his stars and not in himself.

As for the so-called central schools which a kindly providence has now thought fit to provide for the lesser able of the abler pupils from the elementary school, they are a sheer mockery and a delusion. The more favoured and better of them are fighting their way through to recognition as secondary schools; and good luck to them in the fight, though it is the last thing they were intended to do. But to be asked to do secondary school work, and that of an experimental nature, under elementary school conditions of service, was, indeed, a straw fit to break any camel's back. It is said that in some places the central schools are a success. Success in what? In proving that with however many difficulties you confront an English teacher he will, if he is a good specimen of the type, overcome them somehow and deliver the goods. What sort of goods, and what becomes of them after delivery, let no one inquire too closely.

Regarded as an instrument for giving the masses of the people sufficient haphazard education to make them definitely discontented with their lot without affording them any sure means of bettering it, the English State system of education is superb. Regarded as an instrument for the education of a democracy, it is ludicrously inefficient. Simply because the people in whose hands it has grown up have never understood the people for whom it was to cater. They have never entered into their life sufficiently to appreciate their needs. They have never treated them as

[1] 'The Secondary School Boy,' *Nineteenth Century and After*, February 1927

equals, but always as an inferior race to whom some measure of education ought to be given, not specifically in their own interests, but in order that they might be more efficient and capable servants. Thinking in terms of their own life, they have offered them a distinctly inferior brand of their own education, shorter in duration, infinitely cheaper and much more utilitarian. They have never touched the problem of their political education; it never occurred to them to do so, for they themselves were quite capable of doing all the government that was necessary in the good old days, and so long as they could be assured of an adequate supply of clerks to run their offices, of butchers, bakers and candle-stick makers to keep their homes in comfortable order, they felt no necessity of any more specialised assistance. Hence all the clutter and clatter of recent years about vocational education. Who ever heard about vocational education in any public school, Oundle excepted? And at Oundle Sanderson was never interested in vocational education, for all that people said he was. He was interested in education, and was fumbling his way to a modern conception, having realised (what few other educationists appear yet to realise) that the Middle Ages have definitely ceased to be, and that it was time someone began to think about the meaning of education in the modern world. How he must have laughed when all men conspired to praise his work and to tell him that it was quite true that education was too academic and bookish, and how glad they were to see that boys were at last learning something that would be really useful to them! And how in his heart he must have treasured his ideal of a temple of silence, right in the heart of his school, where spiritual values could be worshipped in reverential awe!

We shall never get any approach to an educated democracy in this country until we realise clearly one or two very hard facts. First, that before you can have an educated democracy you must offer your democracy an education that is likely to make it one. And that education has got to be thought out in England from the very beginning, and right through from A to Z, without prejudice, without longing side-glances at any type of education, however good, now in existence, but quite dispassionately and solely with regard to the facts. We can start with one *a priori* assumption only, and that is that there is as good material in the sea of democracy as ever came out of any other sea. Then we can get down to the business of studying the environments, that from which our material comes and that to which its ability could carry it if it were properly nurtured and trained. In the course of that investigation we shall probably realise that any attempt to model our elementary and secondary school systems on the preparatory and public school systems is foredoomed to failure.

Secondly, we must appreciate that, as Dr. Cyril Norwood is at some pains to emphasise in *The English Tradition of Education*, no education can produce an educated democracy which does not place spiritual values first. In the public schools this has always been realised, and in most cases acted up to in practice; in the schools provided for the children of the masses, only rarely has it been realised, and still more rarely has it been possible to give evidence of the realisation in practice. Culture is a much abused word, and one to-day all too unfortunate in its connotation; but it is culture that is wanted in our State schools, culture of the Godhead that is in these children of ours. And whether that culture is to be obtained through the head or the hands or the feet matters not one whit provided it be obtained; give the children the facilities for obtaining it, and they will experiment until you or they will discover their way to it. Thirdly, if a democracy educated politically is desired—and surely it must be if democracy as a principle of human government is to persist—you must commence the process in the school. If government is to be of the people by the people for the people it must be understanded of the people; and the child of the people must grow up with the idea of democratic government. It is useless to expect, as General Smuts apparently does, the universities to train the generations in leadership: that will never produce an educated democracy; it will make government the close preserve of the few. England knows a very great deal about training for leadership (though not all), and a very great deal of how to make university life impossible for all except the comparatively well-to-do; and the combined knowledge will quite certainly exclude from leadership, as it has excluded in the past, all too many of the poor but indigent, who, even if they reach the university (which they all too rarely do), will start with too great a handicap if they have not already received specific training. No, if school is an apprenticeship for life—and we are exceedingly fond of saying that it is—it must be an apprenticeship for public as well as private life; and it must be made that, not by talking about civics—a futile process—but by living civics. In educational circles we talk and talk and talk about teaching civics, and no one seems to get one step further; of course not, because one cannot teach civics. And all the time the golden opportunity lies ready to our hands; every school is a community already partly organised, and wanting only the touch of the expert to turn it into a model of governmental or local administration. Every child might, if the opportunity were seized, live his school life in his miniature State, finding within it the career open to talent, and then pass out into the greater State with a developed and sane comprehension of how the affairs of a community are managed.

School is an apprenticeship for life; let us rest on that phrase, for it has meaning and encloses the truth. Not quite the whole truth, however, when we are considering the education of our English people. Enlarge it a little, and you get the whole truth; school is an apprenticeship from life to life. In plain words, you want an educated democracy in England; very well, then you must be prepared to take the children of the people and rigorously train them away from the life in which they have hitherto grown up. You must apprentice them to a higher, cleaner, broader life; and you must start from the beginning. You must literally clothe them and feed them and wash them and teach them deportment and manners (they do all this in the infant departments of many an elementary school, without instruction or thanks); you must assume that they know nothing, and are likely to know nothing, but what you teach them of art, literature, music, politics, economics, ethics, morality (except a savage individualism) and religion; that their taste is already corrupt and will grow more corrupt if you do not train it strenuously; that their environment is all against ideas of service, courage, truth, honesty and justice; and that all you have to rely upon is, first, a preternaturally clear and sharpened intelligence, and secondly, a devotion and love which, if fostered, will awaken all the finer elements of character. Your assumption will be unfair in many cases, but it is safer to make it. Then you must envisage life—all life, every aspect of life; and you must work out your scheme of training for these children. You must not forget education for livelihood, nor for leisure, nor for the public life, but you must devise it in terms of the life from which these children start and in terms of the life they may achieve. No easy task this, but it has the merit of being one which has not yet been attempted in this country. All we have done so far is to try to impose upon these children a little learning (without preparing the ground for the reception of that learning), a little skill (without reference to whether that skill is really a necessity or not; someone said recently that the problem of practical work in schools was one about which we must be prepared to do a lot of hard thinking; it certainly is, for so far we have done too much experimenting with practical work without any really hard thought about the matter at all), a little taste (again without preparation of the ground), and a little and rather confused notion of better things, vaguely presented and rarely brought within reach. A few children have won through in spite of all obstacles; as for the rest, well, they have just drifted into some sort of inadequate life. And most of them are too good to drift.

H. C. Dent.

AN EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

III. The Future of the Public Schools

Is there a future? In his book[1] published last year Mr. Hill appears to be very doubtful whether public schools will still exist in the future scheme of things; after more than thirty years as a schoolmaster he 'does not see that any place can be assigned to Eton or any similar foundation in English life of A.D. 2000.'

This pessimism is alarming, but there are solid grounds for it. The increase of taxation, which presses so hardly on the professional class, the development of national secondary schools with unlimited money provided by the taxpayer, the hostility of the Labour Party to what are regarded as strongholds of class prejudice—all these are factors that must be taken into account if we are to consider the future of public schools. How long will parents be able, and willing, to pay from 150*l*. to 300*l*. a year, over a period of at least nine years, for the education of their sons, when they must also, through taxes, pay their share in the provision of State schools, in some respects perhaps better equipped for the purpose? Why should England be the only country in the world where such a state of affairs prevails to any large extent? And is it likely that this will continue? These questions demand an answer which it is the purpose of this article to try to supply.

First let us turn to the past. There even the smallest amount of research reveals the fact that public schools have always had critics who prophesied their extinction; frequently they have been the target of such general abuse and criticism that it seems amazing that they have survived. For some reason, difficult to follow, opponents and supporters of public schools tend to go to extremes of criticism or praise.

In the year 1784 William Cowper wrote the poem *Tirocinium; or, A Review of Schools*, in the form of a letter to a friend trying to persuade him not to send his sons to a public school. After describing in flowery language the splendid home training of the boy until the time when he is old enough to go to school the author proceeds:

[1] *Eton and Elsewhere*, by M. D. Hill, published by John Murray.

Would you your son should be a sot or dunce,
Lascivious, headstrong, or all these at once;
That in good time the stripling's finished taste
For loose expense and fashionable waste
Should prove your ruin, and his own at last;
Train him in public with a mob of boys,
Childish in mischief only and in noise,
Else of a mannish growth, and five in ten
In infidelity and lewdness men.

After describing the bad habits that the boy may be expected to acquire, Cowper goes on to deliver a slashing attack on the teaching given at public schools, and finally, after 200 lines describing all the evils of the age, he ends up by attributing them all to the training given at these institutions :

See womanhood despised, and manhood shamed
With infamy too nauseous to be named,
Fops at all corners lady-like in mien,
Civeted fellows, smelt ere they are seen ;
Now flushed with drunkenness, now with whoredom pale,
Their breath a sample of last night's regale ;
All these, and more like these, were bred at schools.
And if it chance, as sometimes chance it will,
That though school-bred the boy be virtuous still,
Such rare exceptions, shining in the dark,
Prove, rather than impeach, the just remark.

In 1860 and 1861 some serious criticisms of public schools appeared in the *Cornhill Magazine* and the *Edinburgh Review*, with the result that a Royal Commission was appointed to make a thorough investigation into the public schools of the country. The report of this Commission makes interesting reading, and the necessity for reform was in most cases thoroughly justified. *The Times* in an article which appeared on March 28, 1864, gives to its readers the following summary of the report of the Commission :

In one word we may say that the Commissioners find public school education to be a failure.

In 1897 the following occurs in a leading article in the *Athenæum* :

Life at an ordinary public school is gregarious, in our opinion to an unhealthy extent ; it is lived by the standard of a rather dull majority, much preoccupied with things of the body and hampered by very obtuse traditions.

To come to more recent times we read in the *English Review* in 1912 :

It is not an exaggeration to say that fully half of the boys who go to our public schools come away mental derelicts, incapable of concentration, their whole outlook focussed on their own personal pleasure and gratifications, looking at all serious things and at all men who work seriously with

contempt. The truth is that the public school spirit has had its day. In bygone times they were hard training places of character and mind; they fashioned men. In their modern conditions of ease, plutocratic luxury, and emasculate laxity, they no longer turn out the men that England requires; they no longer educate the boys adequately or sensibly; rather they mould them into vapid useless creatures who are neither men nor gentlemen.

Finally in 1919 we find an article entitled 'The Public Schools' which sums up the matter as follows:

> Sooner or later parents will realise the facts that boys do no work at school, that they are taught next to nothing, that the spiritual and intellectual life does not exist for them, that for want of something better they have made a god of games.

A damning indictment; and yet it heralded ten years of the greatest popularity and prosperity that the public schools have ever known. The years 1919 to 1929 have seen most of the older foundations crammed beyond bursting point; newer foundations, after many years of struggling existence, at last firmly established with the magic number of 300 boys, laid down by Thring as the ideal size of a public school; while to meet the growing demand for accommodation several new schools have been founded.

What is the reason for it? Will it continue? What of the future? Without answering these questions for the moment, I give it as my personal opinion that there is only one thing that can interfere with the continued prosperity of the public schools, and that is the establishment of State boarding schools. I believe that the educated classes in England have got the idea firmly fixed in their minds that for those important years in a boy's life it is better that the whole of his education—moral, mental and physical—should be handed over to specialists. So long, therefore, as the public schools can attract to their staffs the right type of master (and on account of their improved finances they were never better able to do so than at present), so long will the demand continue, and until some other alternative is presented I believe that the future of the public schools is assured.

What of the alternative? Is there any chance that the State will intervene and establish boarding schools of an accepted model throughout the country? This question has been discussed before. On the grounds of health alone various writers have suggested that though we cannot bring the country and the seaside to the overcrowded towns, yet we can take the children to the country and the seaside. Personally I am inclined to think that the task would be too difficult and too costly to be undertaken with any hope of success. It must always be remembered that the public schools are not commercial concerns; legally they are charities, and, actually, the great majority have been built up over long periods

very largely by the generous gifts of old boys and other supporters. If the public schools had been compelled to provide out of their own resources the capital cost of all their buildings and equipment, the fees they would have to charge would be so enormous that I do not believe there would be half a dozen that could continue to exist. If the State were to enter the market it would have to satisfy the public demand for school chapels, playing fields, fives courts, swimming baths, libraries—in fact, the whole of the equipment which most public schools nowadays possess, but which in their case has been largely provided by founders and benefactors.

Turning from this side of the subject to the more general one of the future of the public schools themselves, it is interesting to observe what is going on in the United States. There we have a great democratic country with a highly-developed system of free education. In most of the States there is keen rivalry that their schools shall be the best that money can provide, and nothing is spared in order that the equipment and teaching should be up to date. It would be impertinent in an article like this to attempt any criticism of American education, and I shall not try, but for some of the results I would point to a book by Judge Ben Lindsey, recently published, entitled *The Revolt of Modern Youth.* The object of this writer is to present a picture of what is happening to the youth of America, and it is certainly illuminating. Whether as a result of the tendencies there described or whether as a natural growth, it is very striking that the last few years have seen an enormous increase in the number and importance of American private schools, or what in our absurd terminology we should describe as public schools. A few of the best known of these are—Exeter, founded in 1783 and now a great school with more than 600 boys; St. Paul's, which dates back to 1855 and now has more than 400 boys; Groton, whose first headmaster, Dr. Peabody, has a great name in American education; Laurenceville, with more than 400 boys; St. Mark's, founded by Joseph Burnett in 1865; Hill School, which in 1876 had only two masters and twenty boys, but developed in the next thirty years to a school of forty masters and 375 boys, in spite of being twice burnt down during this period; Andover, founded in 1778 by Samuel Phillips for 'the promotion of true piety and virtue,' which now has more than 600 boys.

These schools, whose fees vary between 200*l.* and 350*l.* a year, have shown great vitality during the last twenty years, and some idea of the enthusiasm of their old boys can be drawn from the enormous sums of money subscribed for new buildings, scholarships and other needs of the schools. In a few years St. Paul's raised 600,000*l.*, Andover 400,000*l.*; Exeter 200,000*l.*, while many others have raised sums of money which are positively staggering

when compared with what our English public schools would consider as generous support from their own old boys. At the same time, during the last twenty years, many other schools have been founded, while others have grown in importance, and there is no doubt that the private school is now a serious factor in American education.

These private schools are very much on the models of our English public schools, though, naturally, there are differences which to a superficial observer might appear important. The bedrock principles, however, are the same:

(1) They are boarding schools.
(2) They are non-local, bringing together boys from all parts of the country and from the most varied social and industrial surroundings.
(3) They take over the whole life of the boy for the greater part of his years of growth, and accept responsibility for the whole of his education—moral, mental, and physical.

Why has this come about? To suggest that it is entirely due to social or class prejudice is not a sufficient explanation, and in a country like the United States counts for much less than it does here in England.[1]

First, there is the fact that in most cases, if boys have money (and if they come from wealthy homes it is impossible to keep them without it), then it is not practicable for parents to exercise sufficient supervision and restraint over their sons in the hours of the day when they are away from school. Secondly, and more important, the day school fails to provide the powerful feeling of loyalty to a community that is so valuable in the development of a boy's character. Lastly, and most important of all, with the genus boy slow growth is the best growth, and the boarding school, with its interests in games and athletic contests, keeps a boy young.

This biological principle, so imperfectly understood even in English public schools, which nevertheless act on it universally, has been expressed as follows by Professor Stanley Hall in his great work on *Adolescence*:

> The higher the order of the creature, the slower, as a rule, is its progress towards maturity, and any attempt to hasten adolescence is a sin against nature, often ending in mental atrophy, and even more serious physical and moral consequences.

Here in England, in our usual muddling way, years ago we stumbled unconsciously on this great truth, and I would go so far as to suggest that by the establishment of boarding schools, almost

[1] No doubt domestic difficulties are partly responsible, but I believe that it is mainly due to the gradual realisation, conscious or unconscious, that for sons of comparatively wealthy parents the day school is a failure.

unwittingly, we have done much to preserve the great qualities of our race.

If any illustration is necessary to show the result of ignoring this biological truth, I cannot do better than refer to that remarkable book *Mother India*. After making due allowance for the tropical climate and other exceptional factors, it is clear that the state of things there revealed is the result of the wholly abnormal age of maturity in India. All the evil results of too early assumption of manhood described by Professor Stanley Hall are in *Mother India* most clearly portrayed, and the picture is grim in its stark reality. Of course, India is an extreme example, but there are many educational authorities in France and Germany, to quote but two countries nearer home, who have come to the same conclusion as Professor Hall, and are urging the introduction of measures in their educational systems to keep the boy a boy as long as possible by methods similar to those employed in our English public schools.

It is almost universally acknowledged that the British possess a genius for government, and with our wide Empire it is essential that it should be so. Nine-tenths of the administrators of this Colonial Empire, scattered over the face of the globe, are the products, and not exceptional products, of the public schools. This is a fact which should make the Labour Party pause and reflect before they carry out their avowed intention of trying to abolish what they believe to be unwholesome nests of class prejudice and snobbery. Without admitting the truth of that premise, let us examine the possibilities of action in this direction, bearing, as it obviously does, most vitally on the future of the public schools. In this connexion it is interesting to note the result of similar action which has been attempted in recent years in the United States.

In the year 1922 the State of Oregon attempted to abolish all the private schools, *i.e.* all those which were not under State control. A law was actually passed enacting that these schools were to be closed by a certain date and that thereafter no private school should be opened within the borders of the State. Naturally enough, these schools were determined that they would not be wiped out without a struggle, and they appealed to the Federal courts for protection. Their appeal was completely successful, and in 1924 the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the action of the Government of the State of Oregon was unconstitutional. The decision of the Supreme Court contains the following words:

> We think it entirely plain that the Act of 1922 unreasonably interferes with the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control. The fundamental theory of

liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardise its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognise and prepare him for additional obligations.

In other words, it is declared as a fundamental principle that education is a function of the parent, and not of the State. By authority delegated by the parents to the State there exists the power to enact that children must be educated (and this is actually the law in England), but the parents have the right to choose the person to whom they will entrust the education of their children. The State can, and does, provide schools and teachers, but the parents cannot be forced to send their children to these schools if they prefer to have them educated elsewhere.

This is the essence of the struggle now going on between Mussolini and the Pope, the issue of which is still in doubt.

So far, in England, this battle has not yet been fought, but everything points to it as a possibility in the near future. Personally, I think that the time is past when such a conflict could possibly result in a victory for the State in this country. Public schools are too firmly established, and any attempt to sweep them into the State educational system, though it might have been successful in 1864, is now, I believe, doomed to failure.

To give some idea of the growth of public schools in recent years I give below a list of schools, showing the number of boys at each in the years 1912 and 1928. To avoid the invidious task of selection I have taken the schools given in some statistics published in *The Times Educational Supplement* of March 5, 1912. In an explanatory note *The Times* states that this list contains those public schools in which the majority of boys were boarders and whose headmasters were at that time members of the Headmasters' Conference. The numbers of boys at the schools in 1912 are taken from *The Times* article, while those for 1928 are taken from the current issue of the *Schoolmasters' Year Book*.

	1912	1928
Aldenham	220	240
Beaumont	230	250
Berkhamsted	450	550
Bishop's Stortford	135	360
Blundell's	270	350
Bradfield	275	366
Brighton	250	600
Bromsgrove	140	325
Canterbury, King's School	262	285
Canterbury, St. Edmund's	125	150
Cheltenham	600	711
Cheltenham, Dean Close	220	270
Chigwell	103	225
Christ's Hospital	820	830
Clifton	650	770
Denstone	292	350
Dover	200	320
Durham	102	285
Eastbourne	200	300
Epsom	285	390
Eton	1020	1131

	1912	1928		1912	1928
Giggleswick . . .	144	210	Rugby . . .	570	623
Haileybury . .	500	540	St. Bees . . .	280	230
Harrow . . .	537	668	St. Lawrence . .	206	300
Holt	205	250	Sedbergh . .	220	415
Lancing . .	228	383	Sherborne . .	235	400
Leys . . .	160	250	Shrewsbury . .	340	476
Malvern . .	475	580	Stonyhurst . .	320	400
Marlborough . .	600	750	Tonbridge . .	438	492
Mill Hill . .	250	330	Trent . . .	150	220
Monkton Combe .	160	308	Uppingham . .	450	480
Oakham . .	100	230	Wellington . .	492	600
Oundle . . .	350	565	Weymouth . .	116	140
Oxford, Magdalen School . .	100	160	Winchester . .	450	450
Oxford, St. Edward's . .	130	320	Woodbridge . .	144	140
Radley . . .	240	320	Worcester, King's School . .	150	215
Repton . . .	360	420			
Rossall . . .	300	530	Total . .	17,089	22,373

Here we have some facts which give an indication as to the future of public schools. In the last sixteen years there has been an increase of 30 per cent. in the number of boys at the schools in the list quoted by *The Times* in 1912 as coming under the category of public schools. To the criticism that some of these schools would not now be included in such a list (owing to the fact that they are no longer independent or predominantly boarding schools), the answer is that there are at least an equal number which would now be included. A list made to-day would certainly contain the names of Downside, Cranleigh, Imperial Service College, Hurstpierpoint, etc., which have shown even greater expansion during the last sixteen years, while no account has been taken of new schools, like Stowe and Canford, which have been founded within the last few years.

During these sixteen years we have passed through a catastrophic period which has left the nation not only greatly impoverished, but more heavily burdened with taxation than ever before in English history. In spite of these factors the public schools have shown fully as great development as at any time during the last fifty years.

A further illustration of the growth in the importance of the public schools is given by the figures in the year 1866, taken from the *Public Schools Calendar* of that year, for what are now some of the best known schools.

Bradfield	100	Sherborne	186
Canterbury, King's School .	106	Shrewsbury	183
Charterhouse	138	Tonbridge	170
Clifton	260	Uppingham	299
Lancing	120	Wellington	270
Oundle	125	Winchester	258
Radley	134		

The total number of boys at these schools in 1866 (when the population of the United Kingdom was already about 30,000,000) was 2349, and it has now risen to 6197, an increase of over 150 per cent.

Nearly four years ago, in this Review,[3] I attempted to describe the way in which public schools, in spite of their innate conservatism, had adjusted themselves to the ideas of the present age. It is safe to say now that the public schools of England are more firmly established than at any previous time in their history; signs are not lacking that troubles lie ahead, yet, provided that they can continue this process of adjustment, I firmly believe that their future is assured.

[3] 'Public Schools,' February 1926.

STEPHEN H. FOOT.

AN EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

IV. Adult Education: The Religious Movement

The flood of realism in recent books and plays about the war is meant to carry home to people who were not on active service at least one fact. Amidst the turmoil of fightings without and fears within the elemental forces of human nature too often escaped control. Men either found that they had no reasonable faith wherewith to meet and master this upheaval of life, or discovered that the religion which hitherto had sufficed them was a flimsy convention, in so far as it was not an uncritical acceptance of doctrines and observances now plainly seen to be outworn. As a notable and well-documented book on *The Army and Religion* made clear, much of the mischief was due to the appalling defects in the religious education that most men had received in schools of every sort and churches of all denominations. Blank ignorance was almost better than the crude and fantastic notions which many of them entertained. The natural result was that not a few found circumstances too much for them. Mentally, morally, and physically they crashed.

But that is only part of the picture. About the other outstanding fact the novelists and dramatists are strangely silent. Padres like Studdert Kennedy, P. B. Clayton, and Herbert Gray have written of the response made to straightforward talks about belief and conduct, to simple services of worship, to the administration of the sacrament. All this, of course, might have been temporary, an intelligible and legitimate reaction of the emotions.

> The heart
> Stood up and answered, I have felt!

Yet that was not all. The steadying element in the situation was that men wanted to *know*, and not merely to feel or to act. When Christian scholars such as Dr. Reaveley Glover or Principal D. S. Cairns went out to render service in Y.M.C.A. huts they found themselves besieged by little knots of men eager to ask questions, to discuss, to be taught. The libraries at base camps

or up the line also told their tale of inquiry and study in th sphere of religion. And the distinctive feature of this develo ment was that the religious education thus sought, though in n sense superficial, was not academic; it was a quest of truth i relation to life, and to life at its fiercest.

Readers of the article on 'Adult Education in England, which Professor Dover Wilson contributed to the issue of thi Review for last September will remember that precisely the sam point is made there, but in connexion with the remarkable growt since 1903 in the number of adult classes studying subjects no commonly accounted religious—economics, social and industria history, literature, modern science and philosophy, the arts, an so forth. The adult education movement in general, says D Dover Wilson, is implicitly religious, and his brief sketch of it rise and progress indicates how much, even as a 'secular' move ment, it owes to specifically religious bodies and to a leadershi inspired largely by the spiritual and educational tradition of th Churches. He shows, too, how much, on the other hand, it ha contributed to the advancement of real religion, and how steadil its emphasis upon spiritual values increases. I am here concerne with religious education as a clearly marked, but in no sens isolated, aspect of the adult education movement to-day, and believe that it springs from the same impulse as that to which Professor Dover Wilson ascribes the origin of the Workers Educational Association, the Educational Settlements, and all th other activities now regarded by the Board of Education, th local education authorities, and the universities as a permanen and important part of the national educational system. Adul students in these varied organisations, says the Professor, 'go t class, as their forefathers went to chapel and their ancestors in the Middle Ages went to church, to try and understand the world to get some kind of a working philosophy for themselves in thi difficult universe.'

There are other reasons for the expansion of the adult religiou education movement during the last few years and the prospec of a still more rapid and interesting extension of it in the imme diate future. Among these are the approaching reconstruction adolescent education as a corollary to the raising of the school leaving age, the appeal made by the Archbishops in their pastora letter for a more systematic study of religion on the part of clerg and people alike, and the stimulus imparted to the Church o England by the Report of the Archbishops' Commission or Religious Education. Parents and teachers (whether in da schools or in Sunday schools) will be faced by the questionings o boys and girls whose horizons have been widened, and whose capacity for critical and constructive thinking has been enlarged

by the form as well as the content of post-primary education. If religion is to survive as a creative factor in the way of life which the coming generation will work out for itself, it must be re-experienced and re-expressed, not only in the homes and the churches, but also in the industry, the politics, and the international relationships of the present time. Then, too, the discoveries and deductions of scientists so different in type as Professors Einstein, Whitehead and Eddington and Sir Oliver Lodge are making impossible the materialism so popular at the end of last century. The increasing contact between East and West is raising questions as to the relative values of the religions which have moulded these contrasting cultures. Not least among the means by which thought about religion is being awakened in the minds of men and women who long ago ceased going to church, or who, though consistent church-goers, had been content with an unthinking orthodoxy, is the broadcasting of religious services and the inclusion in wireless programmes of talks and discussions directly or indirectly bearing upon religion, philosophy, and the interpretation of human experience.

No better description than Professor Dover Wilson's, however, could be given of the ground common to the two great enterprises in adult education—the 'secular' and the 'religious,' if such misleading adjectives are admissible—which demand the attention of all who take their citizenship seriously. It will indeed be patent to the attentive observer that the only sense in which the adult education movement as generally understood and the adult religious education movement can be spoken of as two is that each has certain special characteristics and claims: they are at bottom one in purpose and methods, for both seek to put into the hands of everyone in the community the key to that knowledge, insight, and service which make fulness of life possible for the individual and for society.

If this be so, why should we have begun our discussion with a reference to war-time experiences? Because what was happening just then to men on all the fighting fronts was happening also in a slightly different way to those at home. Mr. Stanley Baldwin put the situation very graphically a few weeks ago in a speech that he made at the Albert Hall on the occasion of the fourteenth birthday festival of Toc H: 'I saw the best of the generation of that time going out,' he said, 'and the death-roll soon began. My perspective altered as in a moment, and I felt that all the values we had placed upon life were wrong.' People began to ask whether the religion preached from many pulpits would bear the light of thought or stand comparison with the teaching of the New Testament. It was not only the doubt whether, after all, Christianity and war were compatible that perplexed them; there were the

sinister tendencies in the social order which partly produced and partly resulted from war: these also called for scrutiny, and, if they proved repugnant to the moral sense, for the discovery or rediscovery of a religion, or its equivalent, sufficient to overcome them and to create a more satisfactory type of personal character and social relationships. Moreover, as the troops came back and were turned once more into artisans and teachers, clerks and business men, journalists and farmers, scientists and lawyers, they brought with them the determination to *study* religion in relation to life. Clergy and ministers who had served overseas as chaplains, or as teachers under the Y.M.C.A. Universities Committee educational scheme, knew now that preaching was not enough. Dr. William Temple and Dr. Mansbridge, who had spent ten years before the war in building up the Workers' Educational Association because they realised its spiritual as well as its cultural potentialities, greatly desired to see the Church making use of so fruitful a method. It was at their instigation and amidst this intellectual and moral ferment that the first two Church Tutorial Classes were set going in South London during 1917. That year marks an epoch in the development of adult religious education, a point at which the Churches made a fresh effort to meet the emerging needs of the time, just as the foundation of the W.E.A. in 1903 proved a new starting point for adult education as a whole, a moment of vision when it became clear that the universities and organised labour must unite for the spread of liberal education among men and women of the working class.

It would be entirely misleading to suggest that nothing had been done before this. The records show that Griffith Jones' adult Sunday schools in Wales and the adult schools in England were the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century pioneers of religious education among men and women in the period which followed the Industrial Revolution. These were indeed first in the field of adult education at large, and played no small part in cultivating it throughout last century. The earliest People's Colleges also, of which the Rev. R. S. Bayley, a Congregational minister, founded the first at Sheffield in 1842, and the Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice inaugurated the second (the London Working Men's College) in 1854, definitely stood for the belief that the untrammelled study of religion was an essential element of a liberal education, and included courses on religious subjects in their curricula for such adult students as desired to pursue them. A little later the Y.M.C.A. provided lectures and classes of a similar character mainly for young shop assistants in the City. Thirty years ago John Wilhelm Rowntree stirred the Society of Friends by his reiterated plea for a fresh study and presentation of religion by the lay people who ministered at

Friends' meetings, and he had in view the attraction of thoughtful men and women outside the Churches who would respond to the opportunity of education where they distrusted mere propaganda. The result was the foundation at Selly Oak, Birmingham, in 1903, by the generosity of the late George Cadbury and under the directorship of Dr. Rendel Harris, of Woodbrooke Settlement as a centre of social, educational, international, and religious education for men and women. Six years later Fircroft College for working men was founded hard by, and Tom Bryan, inspired by experience of Christian Social Settlement work in London and the work of the People's High Schools in Denmark, became warden—a fact which meant that no old Fircrofter, going out into voluntary service of the working-class movement, ever failed to appreciate the value of religious education (largely, in most cases, through adult schools) in the creation of an educated democracy. In that same year, 1909, Father Charles Dominic Plater, feeling deeply the maladjustment of industrial and social conditions, started the Catholic Social Guild, with its study clubs, for the education of Catholic working folk in these matters as seen from the religious standpoint of the Roman Church, and his work was crowned by the establishment at Oxford, in 1923, of the Catholic Workers' College.

All these ventures, however, with the possible exception of Woodbrooke and the Catholic Social Guild, were due to the enthusiasm of individual members of the Christian Churches rather than to the action of the Churches themselves. Since 1907, however, the chief missionary societies have co-operated, through the United Council for Missionary Education, in formulating policies and producing text-books for adult students which afford the material upon which widespread study of the anthropological, historical, cultural, religious, social and political facts concerning the peoples of Africa and the East may be based—a department of education which has obviously great value in helping citizens of this country to consider with intelligence and sympathy such issues as are at the present time awaiting decision in East Africa, India, and China. It would, indeed, be difficult to discover a better example of the wide sweep taken by religious education in the true interpretation of the term than this particular piece of work supplies, for here the great world religions are studied in comparison with Christianity, and the outcome of each in a characteristic theory and practice of life is discerned. And it is estimated that at least 50,000 people each year study these books, either in the course of their private reading or as members of study groups.

This last statement raises interesting considerations as to education through books. The National Adult School Union, for

example, publishes something like 25,000 copies annually of its quite remarkable *Lesson Handbook*, containing rich and carefully wrought material for series of discussions on religion in relation to life designed to meet the weekly needs of adult schools throughout the year. The groups of topics include science, art, literature, psychology, social and political issues, international affairs, and so forth. Of the 80,000 men and women who attend the adult schools each week very many use the book as a guide to their reading and a stimulus to participation in the meeting. But a great number of people with whom the Adult School movement has no direct connexion, and of whose activities it is entirely unaware, make the book the basis of their studies, corporate or otherwise. Incidentally, I once heard a Prime Minister say, in the precincts of the House of Commons, that often when he had a non-political speech to make and was in search of ideas he found the *Handbook* invaluable for starting a train of thought! And in considering any aspect of the Adult Education movement it would be a gross omission if one ignored the work of libraries, though the subject is too large to be pursued here. A review of current statistics, however, would reveal a considerable increase during the past few years in the proportion of issues belonging to the category of religious education.

In the nature of things all voluntary educational movements, in their beginnings and at periods of rapidly growing popularity, are sporadic and uneven. It is difficult to assemble and assess the facts with any degree of exactitude. Records are incomplete. Standards vary. There is inevitably a mass of elementary and more or less transient work which nevertheless is far from negligible, since it at least evidences a kindling of interest, sometimes proves a pathway to more serious and persistent effort, and always yields valuable suggestions as to the lines on which more fruitful experiments may proceed. *The Handbook and Directory of Adult Education* devotes a special section to organisations concerned with religious education, so far as facts and figures are at present available, and to its pages I must refer readers of this article for fuller information. But before passing to one or two reflections upon the significance of this movement a few illustrations of the range and vigour which it has attained in the decade since the war may be illuminating.

Church Tutorial classes are organised in very much the same way as W.E.A. classes. The normal class meets once a week for twenty-four weeks and continues for not less than three years; classes established nine years ago are still strong and vigorous. Among the subjects studied are the Old Testament, the New Testament, Church History, the Creeds, Christian Sociology, the Comparative Study of Religions, Religion and Psychology, and so

forth. Each meeting usually consists of a lecture by the tutor followed by general discussion. Students are asked to read for the class and to write essays. The work has grown rapidly. In 1927 there were seventy classes, in 1928 there were eighty-eight, in 1929 there were 160 with a student membership of approximately 2350, and in 1930 there will be at least 250 classes—probably more. They are nearly all parochially organised, and they strike their roots in all sorts of parishes—in tiny villages and in the big manufacturing cities, in the depressed mining areas and in residential districts, in dockland and in suburbs and garden cities. The one restriction imposed upon classes affiliated to the Church Tutorial Classes Association is that the tutor must be a member of the Church of England—a condition which, though not applying to those who join the class as students, is an obstacle in the way of receiving recognition and grant from the Board of Education

The Teaching Church Group for promoting Adult Religious Education came into existence in the latter part of 1925 as the result of a Conference on Adult Religious Education, under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Manchester (now Archbishop of York), convened on the initiative of the Church Tutorial Classes Association. Its aims are to help to create public opinion in the Church on the urgent importance of adult religious education in the widest sense, to put inquirers into touch with the appropriate organisations, and to stimulate diocesan and parochial enterprise in the matter. Already, by means of conferences and publications, as well as through the more direct personal efforts of its members, it has exerted a very effective influence.

A notable place is accorded to adult religious education in the Report of the Archbishops' Commission, presented to the Church Assembly last October. In this connexion the Commissioners, among whom were several experienced and distinguished educationists, say:

> The cordial response which has been made in the last few years to the Missionary Council's education scheme is largely attributable to the demand for reading and thought made upon the students, and to the opportunities offered for discussion and expression work. It appears that societies and associations which follow the principles of adult education to the full are finding good results; much of their class work is in no way inferior to that recognised as adequate in other branches of study. There is much to be said for including the tutorial class method in the educational programme of every Parochial Church Council. Where this is done, the intensive work by and amongst the few sets a standard from and around which provision may be made to meet the need of larger circles.

Another, and considerably older, method of proved value in adult education which has been successfully utilised in this new

[illegible] University Extension classes, with [illegible] and written work following each lecture. About eight years ago the Divinity Lectures Committee, composed of representative Anglican clergy and Free Church ministers, of whom Canon V. F. S. Storr and Principal Garvie were the leaders, was formed in order to promote courses in the Old and New Testaments at University College, London, in co-operation with the University Extension Board. The sustained enthusiasm of adult students was so marked, and the quality of the work done so high, that the Committee felt it a matter of duty to make its experience more widely known. While undertaking no responsibility for any but the London lectures, it has been able to stimulate similar experiments in connexion with other universities, and at the end of last session a comparison between the years 1926–27 and 1928–29 showed that the number of University Extra-mural classes in divinity in England and Wales had increased from twenty-one in the former year to forty-seven in the latter, the last-named total including eleven Three-year Tutorial classes, six Preparatory Tutorial classes, twenty-eight University Extension courses, and two public evening lectures. The universities concerned had increased in number from ten to sixteen, and the subjects of the Extension courses included, besides the Literary and Historical Study of the Bible, the Ancient East and the Modern Mind, the History of Christianity from the Reformation to Modern Times, the Bible in Modern Research, the Philosophy of Religion, and the Teaching of the Bible in Schools. All but a few of these classes and lecture courses were grant-earning under the regulations of the Board of Education. Many were organised by the Y.M.C.A., the W.E.A., or Educational Settlements, frequently in co-operation with the Churches of the locality. An examination of the W.E.A. Annual Report for 1928–29, which contains a complete and detailed list of the association's activities throughout England, Wales and Scotland, elicits the fact that many terminal classes also, conducted in accordance with the Adult Education Regulations and eligible for grant-aid, though not coming within the purview of the universities, took subjects of this kind. It is particularly significant that in so many instances a demand for these studies arises within a so-called 'secular' organisation such as the W.E.A., and that, on the other hand, so many Churches and religious bodies of various kinds, having neither the necessary experience in adult education nor the recognised relationship to the Board of Education and the universities now attained by the W.E.A., the E.S.A., and the Y.M.C.A., seek and are very readily afforded the co-operation of these outstanding pioneers of adult education in its widest sense.

The Y.M.C.A., in addition to the more concentrated work already mentioned, has during the past two or three years arranged

In various towns courses of public lectures by eminent theological and Biblical scholars of all denominations on the modern approach to the Bible. In each case the collaboration of the local Churches and educational bodies has been secured, and the results have been encouraging. In its twentieth annual meeting, held last July, the Catholic Social Guild reported the existence of about 100 study clubs.

Such are some of the facts which substantiate the statement that the last ten or twelve years have witnessed a remarkable advance in adult religious education, and that the motive for this has been widespread desire, not only to understand what religion and the Bible are in themselves, as only the study of their classical documents and of their historical development makes it possible to understand them, but also what they contribute to the solution of the personal, social, and world problems which press upon our generation. When, last August, the World Association for Adult Education held, at Cambridge, its first world conference no provision was made in the programme for a meeting to discuss adult religious education, but when the delegates from more than fifty countries came together request was made that a group meeting on this subject should be held, and the prompt granting of that request was fully justified. At Oxford in September the British Institute of Adult Education for the first time included in the arrangements for its annual conference a sectional meeting on adult education and religion. Far from provoking controversy, as the more cautious feared it might, the discussion served only to reveal the fact that no one regarded the study of religion as anything but natural in a thoroughly comprehensive curriculum of adult education, and that some who had been supposed to be unsympathetic had as a matter of course been providing such courses for some considerable time and with distinct success.

When the B.B.C., in pursuit of the recommendations of the Hadow Committee on Adult Educational Broadcasting, set up its Central Council for Broadcast Adult Education it included a representative of religious education no less than of science, art, music, or literature. Already the corporation had discovered that Sunday afternoon Bible readings, sacred music such as the Bach cantatas now being rendered from week to week, and other items in the programme which are indubitably educative from a religious as well as a general point of view, evoked a very considerable volume of appreciative response. Nor is the attitude of listeners merely passive. Effective discussion groups have been arranged in connexion with series of talks on the history and psychology of religion, the ethical and philosophical questions connected with it, and so forth. The demand increases, and the development of the service rendered by the B.B.C. in this direction

[illegible] of it, will not only [illegible], but will welcome.

We are learning that men achieve cultural development by many avenues, some of which may surprise the academic and the orthodox among us. I have no space in which to write about religious education through the drama—though a particularly interesting group in which a number of eminent actors and actresses are co-operating with leaders in the educational work of the Churches is working out the great possibilities of that medium; nor can I do more than mention by way of illustration the excellent use that the missionary societies are combining to make of the films. The Adult Religious Education movement is no conventional, prosy, or narrow affair, but is full of vitality and variety.

To what conclusions, then, does even this brief summary of the more easily tabulated facts impel us?

Among them at least these are scarcely open to question. The implicit religious element in the Adult Education movement is steadily becoming explicit in the form, not of dogma or propaganda, but of wider and deeper study. The Churches, on the other hand, are awakening, though all too slowly, to the fact that more people than we are apt to perceive want what the Churches can give, but not in the way in which it is commonly given. A new and adequately trained leadership is needed by those who would fain follow this quest, whether within the Churches or outside of them. Education, life, and religion are inseparable, and each is more rich than any one man or any particular group of men can know, save as the treasures dug from many mines are brought into a common centre of free evaluation and exchange—a truth for which the word 'university' stands. And, to go no further, but to quote words used by Mr. Baldwin on the occasion already mentioned in this article:

> It is largely a materialistic age, but it is a spiritual age too, and short-sighted indeed are those who come to the conclusion that with this generation what has been described as organised religion may have lost some of its force, and yet fail to see that never was there a time when people have more searched their own hearts to find a narrow path along which they may walk.

BASIL A. YEAXLEE.

LICENSING REFORM

A NEW SYSTEM

In the January 1915 number of *The Nineteenth Century* an article of mine, with a foreword by the late Earl Grey, appeared under a title nearly similar to this.

Since then my experience has ripened and widened; and as it has fallen to the lot of few, if any, to have controlled so many and so diverse licensed houses, I have ventured again, after years of silence, into the field, in the hope of being able to produce before the Royal Commission and those who are interested in its researches, on both sides of the counter, a case for consideration based upon my own experience and observation. It has been my good fortune to have developed the licensed houses, where the opportunity was afforded, perhaps to a greater extent and in more directions than has been done before in this country. From all this it is impossible not to have learnt a lesson, and here, for what it is worth, is the outline of it.

It is a mere truism to state that the ordinary licensed house is rarely a house for the public, in spite of its name. For that reason many outside the trade would like to see, if not its abolition, then its complete transformation. As it is, in spite of spasmodic signs of evolution, it constitutes an anomaly of modern civilisation except in all too rare instances, for many so-called improvements are, in fact, little more than architectural embellishments. Bill after Bill has been introduced into Parliament in an endeavour to find a solution of the problem how to effect improvement, and at least one such Bill has passed its second reading in the House of Lords. But the project has always hitherto broken down upon consideration of the first clause, which defines what is meant by an 'improved publichouse.' No one appears to have entertained any sufficiently definite idea of what exactly is aimed at, without which information the promoters could hardly expect to know how to set about gaining their object. The fact is that the subject cannot be dealt with by a Bill of this kind, for improvement can only come about by a complete reconsideration and recasting of our licensing system

[illegible] and the conditions under which intoxicating liquor is sold and supplied, such as is now being undertaken by the Royal Commission.

As in the case of all social evils, responsibility must be spread over a variety of interests that, between them, have created a system of laws and of administration which has contributed to the existing state of affairs. The truth of this assertion becomes apparent as soon as we glance at the case for the continued existence of the publichouse.

It is probably correct to suggest that the average citizen who, in its present form, does not use a publichouse looks upon it with varying degrees of aversion—an aversion so rooted in prejudice that those who do not deserve it suffer with those who do. The best that is said of it is that, since a large section of the public demands it, it must be allowed to exist, subject to as many safeguards as possible to prevent it becoming a nuisance. In this spirit the greater part of our licensing legislation has been conceived and framed, with results plainly to be seen. So long as that spirit is abroad neither trade nor public will come into its own.

The fact is that the licensed house—be it hotel, inn, or publichouse—is the only public resort universally accessible in this country where everyone can foregather free of charge for the purpose of meeting others, whether they desire to eat or drink or merely smoke and talk or be amused. It is not easy to see what resort could economically be substituted for it.

When we come to inquire upon what the average person's aversion is grounded it becomes clear that it is not on account of the fact that intoxicating liquor is on sale, because, if that were so, the same objections would be urged against first-class hotels and clubs. Clearly it is that the average publichouse does not satisfy the new standards of life now demanded by the people. In the fact that the licensed house is or should be the only universal club lies the strength of the brewers' position. Let us hope that they will be enabled and induced to realise it.

It is partly this circumstance that also renders the condition of the publichouse a matter of such wide social interest and importance, and imposes upon those to whom a monopoly has been granted so great a responsibility, while it should act as a spur to those who, by reason of their experience, can contribute anything towards improvement. The object of this article is to attempt to indicate in outline what seems necessary to remove the licensing problem from perennial discussion and render the publichouse a place of real refreshment and entertainment both in body and mind for both sexes and all ages and classes of the people. It should be made perfectly clear that the opinion

[illegible] and the suggestions made here are in no way representative, and are entirely my own. And, first, a word as to my credentials.

During some twenty-five years it has been my lot to control some 250 licensed houses of every conceivable kind, from the large hotel to the slum publichouse, in almost every part of the country, and many of the licences have been held in my name. All these houses have been controlled under management on improved lines upon a definite system, and in every case the manager has had a special inducement to develop the sale and supply of food. In the dormitory districts around the large towns, and particularly around London, the demand for food upon ordinary weekdays (Saturdays and Sundays excepted) is at present small, owing to the hours during which the houses are chiefly used. These resident populations require amusement after a drab day in often drabber weather, and to meet this demand entertainment upon an elaborate scale has been furnished wherever and whenever permission to do so could be obtained. Thus, by the enterprise of one great brewery company, orchestral and ballad concerts, dancing, cabaret, music-hall turns, and standard plays in a theatre on the licensed premises by first-class professional artists have all been regularly given. Even cinema shows have been held in one licensed house of which I had charge.

As will be imagined, the number of customers served over this long period in so many as 250 houses runs into very many millions, while the combined staffs amount to many thousands. Yet during the whole period of twenty-five years no conviction in respect of any breach of the Licensing Acts has ever been recorded against any of the staff during the time that any of them were with me, and drunkenness has been markedly absent. Having regard to the average of convictions over the whole country, this very remarkable fact enables me to draw conclusions from my experience with some considerable degree of confidence.

There, however, my small stock of self-satisfaction ends, for it is much easier to point out faults, and even to suggest remedies, than it is to improve matters. With that confession, let us begin with one of the main conditions precedent to improvement—the licensing authority which, our Legislature has invested with so much power. For most of all are required a national policy and a national practice in the general administration of the licensing laws. At present, owing to the latitude given to licensing justices by Parliament and the High Court, the licensed trade is subject to conditions which, taking the country as a whole, can only be described as chaotic, incomprehensible, uncertain, and dependent upon personal or corporate predilections.

The cadi under the palm tree was at least only one individual, of a single mind, even if on occasion he had in view a double purpose. A licensing bench has, in practice, powers nearly as plenary as regards some of the most important of its functions, and it is governed all too often by as many personal prejudices as the number of which it consists. In other words, it has all the demerits of the cadi and seldom, in its collective capacity, his wisdom. Rarely open to listen to any constructive proposals, is as profitable to argue with as the east wind, and it shrivels up enterprise and paralyses progress.

Such a charge without proof savours rather of a diatribe; et me, therefore, give a few examples without particularising oo much. The chaotic diversity of view exhibited by licensing ustices and local councillors in regard to what is fit and proper n a licensed house can be well illustrated from my own experiences. I have controlled houses situated in licensing districts where the playing of a piano or any game was looked upon as lisorderly and undesirable; while in other districts benches nd councils have authorised in similar houses the carrying on of cinematograph performances, music-halls, concerts and stage plays upon the licensed premises. What is praiseworthy in one district is anathema to the next. Dozens of examples of nomalies quite inconsistent with progress or common sense could be given if space permitted.

Some licensing justices are middle-aged when appointed, some are now drawn from a class which is accustomed to regard the publichouse as a place hardly to be mentioned in polite society, ome are more impressed with the necessity of upholding their dignity than in meeting the necessities of social welfare. It is hard to say which of these reasons accounts for their lack of receptiveness to constructive ideas. Quite possibly the complexity of the licensing laws tends to harden them into tradition as being the line of most resistance. For nowhere is tradition harder held than in a licensing meeting. The majority of brewers have at least adapted these methods to suit their own pockets, nd so the public get the houses that the licensing justices think he brewers deserve. To take, for instance, the important question of who may hold a licence. Theoretically, anyone over wenty-one years of age, not debarred by certain very proper disqualifications, may do so if his character is good enough. Practically this is not so, because the law says he must also be 'fit and proper.' These words are variously interpreted in different parts of the country. In some geographical areas a manager for thers is the only acceptable licensee as a matter of general policy. n others he will be debarred for no other reason than because he a manager. Again, some benches or some licensing justices will

measure their idea of temperance by the square yard, and refuse to give permission for enlargements and improvements because to do so would enable a larger number of people to obtain liquor more comfortably and decently. Another bench will make the application for an enlargement of licensed premises or the grant of a new licence the excuse for insisting upon the giving up of another licence, thus making the owners pay twice over for their privilege—a privilege which usually redounds to the benefit of the public rather than the owner. A third bench may take the opposite and sensible view of encouraging and even insisting upon enlargements and improvements. Opinions and prejudices vary, and so does the expression of them. It depends sometimes on private prejudices, sometimes on private interest, occasionally on considerations still more improper. The practice, for example, of calling upon the owners of licensed houses shortly before the annual licensing or special sessions with a trade card bearing even the fact that A. B. is a licensing justice is not unknown.

Many benches, and still more individual licensing justices, are excellent tribunals and judges against whom nothing can be said, and it would be wrong to suggest that instances of actual impropriety are nearly sufficiently numerous to make a case against justices as a whole. It is, however, suggested that a tribunal of much smaller proportions, with an open mind, beyond suspicion, used to weighing evidence, and guided by a knowledge of what a licensed house should be, as well as of local requirements and of the true intentions of the Legislature as laid down in the Licensing Acts, is absolutely requisite as a condition precedent to the provision of licensed houses for people of both sexes and of all classes and ages. As a remedy, therefore, much larger licensing areas are proposed, each under a qualified lawyer, with the status of a stipendiary magistrate, sitting in each petty sessional court in turn in his area along with two local lay justices armed with functions analogous to assessors, in place of the present system of employing licensing justices. To this tribunal all applications at present heard by justices in annual and special licensing session should be relegated. It follows that the new functionary must make himself thoroughly acquainted with the licensed houses and with the conditions under which they are conducted in his area, and, in a general way, beyond it. Obviously even an expert tribunal can do no more than secure the wise administration of the laws as they are. The whole system requires a searching overhaul and alteration, but in this article no more can be said than is necessary for our immediate purpose. Accordingly we pass on to a consideration of the questions relating to the number, distribution, and the description of licensed houses

[illegible]

[illegible] administered.

Hardly any responsible person versed in the business will be found to deny that the number of on-licence houses is grossly excessive, or that their distribution is equally unsatisfactory; and falling revenue adds weight to this contention. For the purpose of arriving at any satisfactory solution we must divide licensed houses into three classes—(*a*) hotels, (*b*) restaurants, (*c*) other licensed houses.

In order to define 'hotels' the only definition already in existence may be adopted—namely, a licensed house, which is an 'inn' where the receipts from intoxicating liquor are not more than half of the total receipts; and to this definition may be added that it must be of a certain size—say, with a minimum of ten bedrooms always available for letting. 'Restaurant' may also follow the existing definition—a place adapted for the purpose where the receipts in respect of the sale of commodities other than alcoholic amount to at least one third of the whole. Hotels and restaurants require separate treatment in any forthcoming legislation—so far, at least, as the grant of new licences, closing time, alterations to the premises, and several other matters are concerned. A good hotel, and even a good restaurant, is always an asset of considerable value to any district, and is ever becoming of increasing importance owing to the enormous road traffic. Such places should therefore not be cramped by conditions which are contrary to international usage or which prevent them supplying entertainment.

For the purposes of dealing with class (*c*)—other licensed premises—all distinctions between on-licences may be neglected. They are separated into two divisions by reference only to their situation. Division I consists of houses situate in 'rural' areas, which may be defined as 'areas not within the boundary of a city or town having a population of more than 6000' (the exact number is not material for my purpose). Division 2 consists of houses situated within any city or borough of 6000 or more inhabitants, and designated here 'populous' areas. This separation is necessary, since it would be economically unsound to impose the same conditions in all respects upon country and town houses.

The greatly excessive number of licensed houses leads to evils too numerous to enumerate here, and experience has proved the case for drastic reductions; while those houses that remain should be redistributed so that in what we term the 'rural' area a maximum of one licensed house to the square mile obtains. The exact number in any area, subject to the above, should be a matter for judicial discretion, according to the needs of the

neighbourhood. In what we designated the 'populous' area a maximum of one on-licence for every 5000 inhabitants should be permitted, but in this calculation due allowance must be made for special areas subject to regular periodical influxes of people, *e.g.*, market towns, business quarters in towns, seasonal resorts, and so on. In making these redistributions no account must be taken of hotels and restaurants as such. To be classed along with hotels and restaurants are railway stations, piers, aerodromes, sports and analogous refreshment-rooms, and these are to be excluded from class (*c*).

Since space admits of no more than an outline of proposals, we pass to the important question what kind of licensed houses are to be allowed. Are they to be drinkshops, or are they to take the form of the most advanced type in this country or abroad?

Having cleared the decks of opposition to progress by our previous proposals, here is our opportunity, and we are at once brought up against the problem of definition, which has proved such a stumbling-block hitherto. Difficult as the proposition is, it is certainly not insuperable, for the definition will suffice for practical purposes if, knowing what we aim at, we lay down certain postulates, leaving scope in plenty for individual genius and giving credit for common sense. Here, again, my recommendations are based upon experience over a considerable space of time.

First, no licensed premises, whether in class (*a*), (*b*) or (*c*), must, after the passing of the requisite Act, have any open bar—the only exceptions to this rule being railway and analogous refreshment-rooms on aerodromes, race-courses, sports grounds and the like, or for a special occasion, where time and space are limited. The only existing definition of a 'bar' is contained in the Children Act, and there it is illuminatingly defined as 'any open drinking bar'! One may venture to define the meaning more precisely by forbidding the sale or supply of intoxicating liquor over a counter situate in the area licensed for sale, or from a stock or store where the liquor is in view of the public. This proviso may at first hand appear to be petty and interfering, but in fact it will go further than any proposal to convert the licensed house into a fit place for the entertainment of people of both sexes and all ages. That it is practicable has been amply proved over a series of years. To enumerate the advantages of this condition would entail too much space. In passing, we may, however, suggest that nothing has prejudiced the public against the publichouse more than the sight of customers almost fighting to be served over a counter during the last hour on a Saturday or Sunday night. In a Continental

[illegible]
and such a thing never happens, and it could not happen even if the closing hours were the same as ours.

Secondly, all houses in class (*c*) must be sufficiently commodious to enable all estimated customers to be seated in reasonable comfort at any normal time, the intention being that our new type of house should resemble, in some degree, the great Continental café or kursaal rather than the tavern of the town. A minimum space must be estimated for each individual and the minimum size of each room indicated for the purpose of securing adequate comfort. The London County Council has already made somewhat similar stipulations in houses on their own estates.

Thirdly, any house in class (*c*), in 'populous' areas only, shall contain at least one room for the supply of all kinds of refreshment, liquid and solid, at prices that working people are accustomed to pay; another room where the price for intoxicating liquor is equal to that of a saloon bar in the district; and a hall of specified size (including a stage or platform) capable of accommodating the estimated customers normally expected in chairs set in rows or otherwise. A portion of this hall must be set aside where no intoxicants can be either sold or consumed; and this arrangement is easily practicable. It is to be a condition of the licence that music or other entertainment is to be provided nightly for at least two hours during permitted hours, unless for good cause shown; the object of this is that the house should be regarded as primarily one of rest and entertainment with food and drink as amenities. In the absence of amusements any publichouse will slip back to the condition of a mere drinkshop, whatever architectural features it may possess.

As regards licensed houses, the power to grant licences in respect of music, singing, dancing, and stage plays must be transferred from the local authority to the new tribunal. This is a *sine quâ non*, because at the present time it is within the power of a retrogade council to wreck the intentions of an enterprising bench by refusing leave to use a hall for the very purposes for which it has been provided—by no means a rare occurrence. An adequate supply of food, according to the reasonable needs of the neighbourhood, must also be available at all hours as a condition of the licence.

Fourthly, the removal of an existing licence from its present site to one suitable to enable the conditions herein set out to be complied with must be readily granted. This is another essential condition, because very few town houses are capable, in their present situation, of adaptation to requirements.

Finally, the permitted hours of consumption, if not also of sale, would need to be extended; for service by waiter is

necessarily much slower than over a bar, and [illegible] requisite.

Let us now examine a few of the main objections to my proposal, for they are fairly numerous, if not substantial. First, it will be objected that the extinction of some 40,000 licences would result in a great displacement of labour. This is so; but the displacement would be gradual, and the great majority will be re-engaged immediately in the new licensed houses, which will each require ten times the number of staff necessary for any ordinary publichouse. Moreover, the abolition of some 40,000 or 50,000 licences will set free that number of houses for conversion into shops or tenements for an enormous number of working people—probably at least 500,000, or, say, ten to every house—thereby resulting in eventual national economy, and making a not unimportant contribution to the housing problem. Obviously no change such as that proposed could be brought about at once without creating widespread hardship and even ruin, and therefore, while every encouragement must be given to an early attainment of the ideal indicated, at least ten years must be given to its fulfilment.

The most difficult part of the proposal will be the working out of a scheme of compensation, and this is not possible without imposing some national sacrifice of revenue from the trade over the period and after, but it will pay, taking the long view, if it thereby almost eliminates over-indulgence and over-temptation. It is only fair that the State, which has allowed our present system to grow up, should bear the chief burden. Off-licences are excluded from the scheme, chiefly because it does not seem absolutely necessary to include them, and so as not to overweight it.

As to taxation: an immediate change should be made in the principle of levying licence duty. The same system—namely, a levy of so much in the pound on purchases of intoxicants—should be imposed on licensed houses as is now applied to clubs; and the penalty for a wilfully false return should be imprisonment and fine. This system would probably result in proportionately increased revenues. The present system is impolitic and often unfair. Again, in place of monopoly value, which is calculation based upon a hypothesis and therefore unreal, a tax on the net profits of the new houses is preferable. A return of the net profits must be made, and the penalty for failure or a false return should be imprisonment plus a fine. Safeguards respecting the term 'net profits' would be necessary.

A great deal of the reason for the present wretched condition of many licensed houses lies in the fact that everyone is trying to take too much out of them, with the result that the public

[illegible] development and enterprise are cramped. The State and the local authorities seek too much in taxation. The owners get the highest rent they can. The brokers get all they can for themselves and the outgoing licensee, with the result that the tenant coming in, generally a man of little substance, is overwhelmed by overhead expenses both before and after he embarks upon the business. In short, the safest, easiest, and cheapest course is to carry on the business as a drinkshop. Such a man cannot afford elaborate catering equipment, or to take risks, having regard to the difficulties in his way in the present state of the law. For this and other reasons, although there are plenty of good tenants, one advocates the management system, which gives a chance of promotion to the employee who has taken the trouble to learn his business thoroughly—for it is a complex, difficult and exacting trade—while this system would also keep the house in the hands of people who can afford to develop it to the utmost. The parrot cry of 'mine host' adopted by some licensing justices as an excuse for encouraging tenancies is mainly insincere, for a modern tenant is rarely an independent person, save in his own estimation, while there is no reason why the manager of a licensed house should not be as good a host as a hotel manager.

Obviously any such scheme as is outlined here would be abortive without including clubs within its ambit. Clubs should be classified in the same way as licensed houses, so that those clubs that are residential would probably come within the 'hotel' definition. Those that are *bonâ fide* clubs for food and rest will come within that of 'restaurants,' and those that do not will be treated as licensed premises, but allowed to co-exist on the same terms. No new club licence should be granted unless an existing club lapses, and then only for good cause shown. They should be taxed in the same way as licensed houses of their class, and they should not obtain any preferential treatment.

Such, with many omissions on account of lack of space, constitutes the brief outline of proposals which, if carried out in the true spirit of their intentions, would contribute one of the great social reforms of our generation, contribute to industrial welfare, create healthy employment, and render the liquor trade free from reasonable reproach.

ALEXANDER F. PART.

CATHEDRALS AND THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY

THE Cathedrals Measure, which in a revised form is under consideration by the Church Assembly, is the result of the Report of the Cathedrals Commission appointed in pursuance of a resolution of the National Assembly. This Report was published with appendices in 1927. The Measure based upon it, after being presented to the Assembly in the autumn session of 1928, was amended by the Committee then appointed and printed on May 16, 1929.

The Assembly had passed it for general approval, and the members in charge presented it for revision in the autumn session of 1929. Meanwhile it had been considered by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, which, after considerable discussion, did not approve it, but passed to 'the previous question.' The members in charge in November 1929 thought that it would now be considered and passed in one morning session. This did not prove to be the case, and the consideration of the Measure, some amendments being passed, only reached to about half-way through. It will be further considered at the next session. It is understood that further amendments are being made by the drafting committee and the members in charge. It is to be hoped that these will be in the hands of the Assembly some weeks before its session. It has sometimes been forgotten how extremely important are the questions involved, and how deeply, though often silently, interested is that very large body of Englishmen which has been taking during the last few years an increasing interest in the cathedrals as centres of spiritual life as well as some of the noblest historic monuments in our land.

So much for introduction. Now for the Measure as it stands. We may well be reminded, in the first place, that, though the Report in 1927 was received with a large measure of approval, and with gratitude to the eminent persons who drew it up under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York (now of Canterbury), when it was translated into suggested legislation it did not meet with anything like unanimous acceptance even from the members of the Commission itself who had signed the Report. It was

[illegible]
...ly urged by some of them that it did not, in several
...portant particulars, correctly represent the meaning of the
...port; and when the Measure came up in a revised form it was
...ted that these objections had not been met. The Measure
...s not a faithful translation of the Report into practice; there
...e many ambiguities and even contradictions. Some of them
...least are believed still to remain. For that reason the Measure
...erves, and will no doubt continue to receive, minute investiga-
...n. The main changes introduced by the Measure are the
...ation of a Cathedrals Commission or Committee by which
... statutes for the cathedrals are to be drawn up, or revised
...put in force, with the approval of the Privy Council; the
...ferring of very definite powers upon the body of honorary
...ons, or prebendaries, of each cathedral; and the transfer of
... property of the dean and canons to the larger body. I am
...erring, of course, to the ancient cathedrals. With the points
...t are thus raised I will deal later on.

Let me brush one obstacle out of the way. It has been
...posed that the prolonged consideration of the present Measure
...ses delay in the acquisition by the new (generally parochial)
...hedrals of the status and the constitutions which they deserve.
...is need by no means be so. The modern cathedrals are quite
...erent in every way from the old. It was very natural, and
...ht, to wish to give them the same position and dignity. But,
...ing to their history and their present position, there was no
...son in the world—except, perhaps, the sentimental one of
...ing 'Let us give them the full glory of the old cathedrals,
...d this can only be done by dealing with all cathedrals in one
...asure'—why they should not have been taken separately and
...en at once the necessary steps towards the acquisition of full
...tus and individual statutes, as has been done for the most
...rt wisely, and with practically universal agreement, in the
...sent Measure. The delay has simply come from the mixing
...ether of two quite different subjects, old and new, and the
...usal of the members in charge to split the Measure into two
...d carry immediately, as they could, all that the new cathedrals
...ire and deserve. No doubt considerable new drafting would
... needed; but this would not pass the wit of lawyers, and if an
...er which was made in November had been accepted a Measure
...cerned with the new cathedrals could have been passed, I
...ieve, through all stages, and unanimously, in the first session
... 1930. Is it too late even now?

But the case is very different with regard to the old cathedrals.
...re, both in those of the 'old' and of the 'new' foundation,
...e are many complexities. It is proposed to get rid of these
... means of a Commission created *ad hoc*, with power to consider,

provide, amend, and ultimately to submit for [illegible] statutes for each cathedral individually. It has been, after the removal of some not unnatural misunderstandings, emphatically stated by the members in charge that the historic and local idiosyncrasies of each cathedral will be preserved, and that no uniformity will be aimed at. While we may fully accept this as the honourable intention of the framers of the Measure, I cannot but think that if the Commissioners are men with ideas they will be compelled to act upon certain definite principles, presuppositions, and aims for improvement which will underlie their treatment of each cathedral in turn. I have been definitely assured by one of the members in charge that the final decision in every case will be with each individual cathedral. But at present there is this exception in the Measure: with regard to new statutes, the bishop has the power to hold them up if his wishes are not acceded to. That the Measure requires the consent of the chapters to any scheme is indisputable. But it is held by many that chapters should not be put into the position of having either (1) to accept a scheme such as the Measure would empower the Commissioners to make, or else (2) to reject a scheme which might go far beyond the terms of the original Report. Thus, to quote a phrase of Lord Salisbury, in a different connexion, in an earlier debate, the Commission might 'trample on the susceptibilities' of several chapters, or more than that.

But this is to look forward—too far, may be. Meanwhile let us consider the present position. The Measure as revised has received a check in the Church Assembly. The House of Clergy has accepted an amendment to the proposed creation of 'a body of seven Commissioners,' preferring 'a Committee [altered, for technical reasons, to a Commission] of the Church Assembly, of which the composition, procedure and duration shall be defined by regulation of the Assembly.' This resolution must clearly be taken, as part of a reasoned policy, in connexion with a motion which was under debate when the Assembly rose: that the schemes proposed for the cathedrals, when completed and sanctioned by the Commission and sealed, 'shall be reported by the Commissioners to the Church Assembly at its next session, and shall thereupon stand for consideration at the same or at the next subsequent session of the Assembly.' This was moved by Mr. Albert Mitchell, who informed the House that in so doing he was following the advice of that eminent lawyer the late Lord Phillimore. Two consequent motions by Mr. Mitchell, which have not yet been reached, were drawn up in Lord Phillimore's own words. To neglect so weighty an opinion as to what is needed would be, I think, dangerous.

I am led the more certainly to this conclusion by a perusal

[illegible] very recently [illegible] I wish that [illegible] who take an interest [illegible] and present position of the Church of England would read this valuable essay. It has no direct bearing upon ecclesiastical matters, but indirectly it has a great deal. The plain fact is we are on the verge of—perhaps are already suffering from—the bureaucratic encroachments which it is the object of the Lord Chief Justice to expose and denounce. That is where the motions of Mr. Douglas and Mr. Mitchell raise an issue of primary importance. The creation of a body of Commissioners responsible to no one, and the passing into law of bodies of statutes which have not been submitted to the legislative body from which the power of the Commission was ultimately derived, constitute a grave danger. The State has its parallel in the Church. I may quote Lord Hewart, for his words are true of the Church as well as the State:

> A little inquiry will serve to show that there is now, and for some years past has been, a persistent influence at work which, whatever the motives or the intentions that support it may be thought to be, undoubtedly has the effect of placing a large and increasing field of departmental authority and activity beyond the reach of the ordinary law.[1]

There have been many signs recently, as could be observed in debates in the Church Assembly on matters such as patronage, parsonages, and pensions, that the clergy, and unless I greatly mistake the laity too, are becoming apprehensive of the largely increased powers assumed by the bishops in recent years. Now one of the difficulties feared from the Cathedrals Measure is that these powers will be still further increased. I need not make the hackneyed quotation of the famous motion of Mr. Dunning in regard to the House of Commons. The Cathedrals Measure, which proposes apparently to place the final power in the hands of the whole body of honorary canons, supplementing the canons residentiary, may seem to place entire control in the hands of the bishops, who always appoint all the honorary canons, and in several cases, such as that of the cathedral which I serve, the residentiary canons as well. Give a Commission very large powers as regards statutes to bind the cathedrals, and give the bishop the appointment of those whose consent is necessary to the enacting of those statutes, and what will be the result? I will quote Lord Hewart again:

> It is one thing to confer power, subject to proper restrictions, to make regulations. It is another thing to give those regulations the force of a statute. It is one thing to make regulations which are to have no effect unless and until they are approved by Parliament. It is another thing to

[1] *The New Despotism*, p. 11.

make regulations, behind the back of Parliament, which come [illegible] without the assent or even the knowledge of Parliament.[1]

He is referring, of course, to the State. But what he says bears exactly on Lord Phillimore's opinion and Mr. Mitchell's resolutions. It would be most unwise for the Assembly to agree to the granting of such wide authority once and for all without any power remaining in the legislative body to approve or disapprove.

But that is what bureaucracy, wherever it be found, bitterly resents. Lord Hewart quotes the case of the Local Government Bill introduced in 1929. A clause to secure the control by Parliament was resisted. This was met by constitutionalists.

> The attack, such as it was, was directed against the second part of the clause, which provided merely that 'every order made under this section shall be laid before Parliament as soon as may be after it is made.'[2]

It was desired to obtain a real, not an imaginary, power for Parliament. Was this done? I am not sure.

Lastly, in this connexion let me quote from the same source some pregnant words of Lord Justice Bowen, which I hope every member of the Church Assembly will take to heart when Mr. Mitchell's motions and Lord Phillimore's advice come again to be considered.

> If no appeal were possible, I have no great hesitation in saying that this would not be a desirable country to live in, where every parochial officer might do as he liked in this matter. It is true that there is enough difficulty in appealing as it is; but if there is to be no appeal at all possible the system would be intolerable.

Never mind the words 'parochial officer'; there are such in higher places than Bumble. There is a good deal, every reasonable man will admit, to be said for the presbyterian system; there is very little, if anything, to be said for an entirely uncontrolled episcopacy. And if the Cathedrals Measure were carried into effect in a drastic manner a cathedral close would not be at all a desirable place to live in.

For the bishops who have been concerned in the production of the Measure we all have the highest respect; for none more than the Bishop of Oxford, who is remarkable indeed for his learning, his wisdom, his sagacity, and his common sense. But two things have to be remembered: first, that, as he has explained to the Church Assembly, during part of the period of the Measure's progress he was laid aside by illness; and secondly, that Christ Church, the only cathedral of which he has intimate personal knowledge, is entirely excluded from the scope of the Measure.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 19.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 56.

[illegible] everything? 'Control all other bodies [illegible] [illegible] but hands off Christ Church!' But this by the way. If a 'Cathedrals Commission' is to be appointed the public should have a vigilant eye upon its powers as granted as well as its actions in the future. It was originally proposed that it should be permanent. This, in consequence of protest, was modified in the following clause:

> The powers of the Commissioners shall continue in force until such date not being earlier than the expiration of seven years from the passing of this Measure or later than the expiration of twelve years from the passing of this Measure as the Church Assembly may by resolution determine, and in the absence of such determination shall cease on the expiration of twelve years from the passing of this Measure.

But can anyone doubt that this makes it extremely probable that 'under pressure' from high authorities the Commission will become permanent? It is not easy, and it is ungracious, to appoint eminent and salaried persons with a staff of clerks, and when they have done their best to prove themselves energetic to terminate their engagement. They will rightly claim after seven years to be experts. But how about the bodies which have behind them the knowledge of centuries?

What then? No one denies that there is obsolescence in some cathedral statutes and ambiguity in others, though there is not nearly so much as fanatics fancy. Almost all the statutes, except those which have quite clearly waxen old and are ready to vanish away, can be worked by sensible men. But, be the need for change as great as some suppose, why in the world should it not be effected by the provision which obtains at Exeter and, I think, elsewhere? Why should not power be given to the present governing body of each ancient cathedral to revise its own statutes—insist that they should do so, if you think it necessary—and then provide that full legal sanction should be given to the revision by whom you will—the archbishop of the province, the Lord Chancellor, the Church Assembly or the Convocations, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or the Privy Council, as may seem best to the enlightened wisdom which is so much in evidence to-day?

Do not think that I am saying all that I should like to say about this Measure—'full of mischievous potentialities,' as *The Times* says. I could say twice as much, or more, if the editor could spare the space. But I will continue as briefly as I can by calling attention to a few among very many debatable points.

The cathedrals are to possess two chapters—a general, or cathedral, one and an administrative one. The powers of

[illegible] are defined. We have been informed that [illegible] [illegible] quite differently in different statutes. Is this in the least likely? Will a Commission, an Assembly, or a Parliament be satisfied that in one of the old cathedrals the power of supreme control should rest with five or six men, in another with twenty-five or thirty? That would reintroduce the anomalies which the Reform Bill of 1832 removed from the parliamentary franchise. Besides, what is implied in the phrase 'administrative chapter'? For whom is this chapter to administer? Whoever that be, that, they or he, must in all reason hold the supreme power. I think it is of necessity implied by the provision that the property of the cathedral should be vested in that body that this power will reside in the general chapter. I presume that this proposal, in itself and for what it involves, will be strenuously resisted. But we have not come to it yet. (The idea that such a bone of contention, with a score of others, could be easily masticated in one morning does amuse as well as amaze me!).

One other point—I do not think it is a trivial one—I will mention. It is the provision that deans and canons should retire at a fixed age, a certain permission to allow a limited extension being left to the bishop of the diocese. That is a fashion of the day, you may say; but it is not at all a good fashion. The case of the universities has been quoted. I am informed that the rule works very badly; at Cambridge some of the ablest and most valuable men are not allowed to serve on any syndicate; at Oxford the head of a college, retired by an age regulation, is at once employed on most important business by the Government. The compulsorily retired head of a great public school is now engaged in more work of public importance than he probably ever had in his life. There is much humour, presumably unconscious, in the following facts. Deans and canons, who are quite rightly supposed to have work to do which is less physically arduous than that done by bishops or parish priests, must retire at a certain age, but there is no provision anywhere that the more strenuous labourers should cease their exhausting activities. A bishop of, shall I say eighty?—I have not drawn up a table of bishops' ages—may require the resignation of a dean or canon several years younger than himself If he is also the dean of his own cathedral church, as some are, he will have to cease to be dean, but will remain bishop. There are a number of canonries annexed to archdeaconries—London, for example. What will happen to them? An archdeacon who holds a canonry not so annexed will have to give up his canonry, but will retain the gaiters which are supposed to be the badge of his rotatory activities. Only the late Sir W. S. Gilbert could collect and illuminate so large a series of anomalies. I forbear the attempt.

[illegible]

[illegible] readers that when Dr. Fry [illegible] [illegible] Measure considers too advanced for [illegible] His Majesty the King, in congratulating him, expressed a hope that he would long continue his work. I must say I prefer the King's wisdom to that of the 'members in charge.' When the clause was reached in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury the Dean of Lincoln made a most emphatic, humorous, and sagacious *oration*, which was received with the greatest enthusiasm by the House, and by the members in charge with bated breath and apologetic humbleness. I believe that the House was in almost universal agreement with the Dean when he moved: 'That this House is of opinion that a better method for limiting tenures in chapters, where such tenure is no longer efficient, is to be found in the constitutional powers of the visitor, with assent of chapter, than in any mere age limit.'

I have said a little about bishops. There is much more to be said. The Commission and Measure rightly refrain from dealing with the difficult question of the ordinary. It is understood that the Commission was quite rightly opposed to the position of ordinary in the cathedral being given to the bishop. In some cathedrals the ordinary is the dean, in some the dean and chapter. But the historical question is too intricate for brief consideration, and the practical one hardly ever presents any difficulty. I have said little about the honorary canons. We all agree that they deserve more power in the election of a bishop, in consultation, perhaps in patronage. More than that I believe hardly any of them desire. We do not yet know what the Measure really means, but if it means what has been generally supposed, nothing better can be said than has been said by the Dean of St. Paul's, whom I do not think the 'members in charge' can believe to be lacking in intelligence.

> The remedy proposed by the Committee is one of the most foolish ever suggested by a responsible board. It is to make the honorary canons or prebendaries the governing body of the cathedral, the dean and chapter being only an executive committee acting under them. It is well known that the honorary canons are almost without exception hard-working parish priests, selected in recognition of their good services in that capacity. They have no knowledge of the administration of the cathedral, and no time to attend to it. The only consolation, if this Measure is carried, is that, being sensible men, they would not dream of interfering. But that is no excuse for a change which has nothing in its favour except that it is manifestly unworkable.

The words '*governing body*' have been withdrawn; but are we quite sure that the idea in the minds of the framers of the statute, on which they laid so much stress, does not remain? I think it a great matter of regret that no provision whatever has been

made for the advancement of learning or study in any cathedral to-day. As the archbishops have assured us, it is one of the primary needs of the time. The Measure entirely ignores it.

The general scope of the Measure has been severely criticised. *The Times* has said quite plainly that 'neither new statutes nor new rules but new income is, in point of fact, the paramount need of our cathedrals to-day.' That was the view of Lord Cave's Commission, from which all this business started; but it has entirely passed out of the present survey. There is no provision for financial help in the Measure; heavier burdens are imposed, or at least implied. Clarity, in which the Measure is sadly deficient, is almost as essential as cash; but meddling will certainly not provide money. Again, there was an extremely sensible article in the *Quarterly Review* of July 1929. I should like to quote pages of it. I will be content with this:

> Our cathedrals cannot be cheap to run, and must tax resources to the utmost; but allowed to develop along their own lines, according to resources and local conditions, and given their own essential corporate life, they have a contribution to offer to the national life greater than ever before. Rising like so many islands above the floods of secularism by which the world is being reduced to a state of efficient impotence, always standing foursquare for the things which are not seen, they are willing to reform their methods of work and to move with the times, but the while have as their constant office to remind the world that but one thing is needful, and that Mary was commended at the expense of Martha.

A still more potent critic is the Dean of St. Paul's. Writing in the *Church of England Newspaper* on September 27, 1929, he concludes: 'The new Measure should be either amended or scrapped. The members in charge have given way about the permanent commission, but I doubt whether this concession goes far enough.' It does not. Behind the whole question is that of English liberty. I have heard many people say that the cathedrals are the only place left in the Church of England where liberty remains. I am not sure that they are wrong. I will be content not to give my own opinion, but to quote that of Dr. Inge. I hope laymen will listen to him, as in the past they have so eagerly done, and as they still, in secular as well as ecclesiastical matters, quite obviously do.

> There is a widespread uneasiness at the way in which the bishops are steadily drawing all patronage and power into their own hands. The parson's freehold, and still more the diversity of patronage, have been a great safeguard of liberty in the Church of England. They prevent the dioceses from becoming nurseries of the particular opinions held by the bishop. Even as things are, there have been dioceses (let no one think that I am referring to London) where the position of an Evangelical, or of a Liberal, or of an Anglo-Catholic, as the case may be, has been none too pleasant. In such dioceses, the independence of the cathedral, under

[illegible]

its own officials, in a great strait.) That the Bishops wish to curtail this independence is plain from the Bishop of Gloucester's Charge in [illegible] (*The Church of England*, chap. xi.) and from certain parts of the New Measure.

When I look back upon the cathedrals question I am conscious that it presents a large field with many pitfalls, and that a large scheme has been prepared, but it has many ambiguities. What I plead for is that no one should be too much impressed by his own reforming wisdom, and that all proposals should be scrutinised in a friendly, candid, but thoroughly informed investigation.

W. H. Hutton.

DOMINION STATUS

RECENT events in India have once more directed general attention to 'Dominion status.' But what precise meaning does the plain man, or, for that matter, the expert jurist, attach to that phrase? Political controversy is apt to popularise a phrase—it rarely elucidates its meaning. Nor did the parliamentary debates on Lord Irwin's recent declaration contribute substantially to that desirable end. Yet it is of great practical importance, not merely to India, but to the Empire at large, that ambiguity should, as far as possible, be resolved—that we should, following Dr. Johnson's injunction, 'clear our minds of cant.' To India, because it is one of the many ironies arising from the dubious gift of Western education to a small minority of the Indian peoples that phrases are apt to assume a significance which have little reference to their connotation; to the Empire at large, because we are on the eve of another Imperial Conference which, however much it may strive to concentrate (and very properly) on economic relations, cannot ignore the unsatisfactory position in which we were left, in regard to constitutional status, by the Conference of 1926.

Is 'Dominion status' synonymous with 'responsible government'? It sounds more precise than 'self-government'; but is it? 'Responsible government' has a technical connotation and can be exactly defined. It means, and ever since the 'forties has meant, a system of government in which the executive side of government is responsible to and controlled by the Legislature. All the greater Dependencies of the British Crown have attained to that constitutional status by gradual stages. British North America showed the way. Canada (as we may shortly call it) emerged from the *Règne militaire* to find itself under Crown Colony administration. The next stage was marked by the setting up of local Legislatures both in Upper and Lower Canada. That stage was accomplished by the enactment of Pitt's *Canada Constitutional Act* of 1791. Under that Act there was to be a Governor for each Colony, assisted by an Executive Council and a bicameral Legislature—a nominated Council and an elected House of Representatives. But the Legislature had no control over the Executive, which continued to be vested absolutely in

[illegible] representative institutions. The position thus attained was roughly the same as that which, almost from the first, the original English Colonies on the Atlantic seaboard had enjoyed. It did not long satisfy either French or British Canada. A representative Legislature without a responsible Executive, though it marks a common, and often a prolonged, stage in constitutional evolution, is apt to breed trouble. In Charles Buller's striking phrase, the system is 'like a fire without a chimney.' The lack of a responsible Executive was the root cause of the English Civil War in the seventeenth century. It was largely responsible for the rebellions in Upper and Lower Canada in 1837. In Lower Canada, more particularly, there was in the late 'thirties perpetual conflict between the Assembly and the Executive.

> Having no influence in the choice of any public functionary, no power to procure the removal of such as were obnoxious to it merely on political grounds, and seeing almost every office in the Colony filled by persons in whom it had no confidence, [the Assembly] had recourse to that *ultima ratio* of representative power to which the more prudent forbearance of the Crown has never driven the House of Commons in England, and endeavoured to disable the whole machinery of government by a general refusal of the supplies.

Lord Durham, in writing thus, had apparently forgotten the history of the Puritan Revolution; he ignored documents of such importance as the *Petition of Right* and the *Grand Remonstrance*; but, though his historical memory was short, his political instinct was sure. He accurately diagnosed the situation in Canada, and, in his famous Report, he prescribed the remedy which was to prove efficacious not only in Canada, but, at the appropriate stage, in all the great English-speaking communities under the British Crown. The passages in the Report referring to this matter have become *loci classici*, but they must, for reasons which will presently emerge, be quoted once more: 'The Crown must consent to carry on the government by means of those in whom the representative body has confidence.' This sentence might have been textually extracted from the *Grand Remonstrance*. And again:

> The responsibility to the united Legislature of all officers of the Government, except the Governor and his Secretary, should be secured by every means known to the British Constitution. The Governor . . . should be instructed that he must carry on his government by heads of departments in whom the united Legislature shall repose confidence; and that he must look for no support from home in any contest with the legislature, *except on points involving Imperial interests.*

A claim has lately been made that the root idea of Lord Durham's famous Report originated in Upper Canada itself, and was put forward as early as 1828 in a letter written in that year

by Dr. W. W. Baldwin to the Duke of Wellington. Dr. Baldwin called the Duke's attention to a 'principle of the British Constitution, in the actual use of which the Colonists alone hope for peace, good government and prosperity.' This principle, he explained, was 'the presence of a provincial Ministry (if I may be allowed the use of the term) responsible to the provincial Parliament, and removable from office by His Majesty's representative at his pleasure and especially when they lose the confidence of the people as expressed by the voice of their representatives in the Assembly.'[1] Whether the Tory Prime Minister would have been likely to hand on this suggestion to the servant of the Whig Government which supplanted and succeeded him seems to me doubtful; but Dr. Baldwin's letter unquestionably contains a remarkable and almost verbal anticipation of the central passage in Lord Durham's Report. Whether Durham utilised it or not, the fact remains that his Report, and particularly the passage here quoted, has long been accepted as the classical definition of 'responsible government,' and the *Magna Carta* of Colonial self-government.

In the course of a few years the central doctrine of the Durham Report was definitely and finally accepted as the ruling principle of Canadian government. Responsible government was introduced into New Brunswick in 1847 and four years later into Prince Edward Island. It has since been extended to all the more important Colonies in the British Empire.

The last six words (italicised) in the above quotation have not, however, received the attention they demand. The neglect was natural enough in the 'forties and for many years afterwards and that for two reasons. On the one hand, there was no question of a Colonial Legislature interfering in the conduct of Imperial affairs. On the other, if it had, it would have aroused little emotion in the Imperial Parliament.

Throughout the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century Imperial interests were regarded as of little importance by the Imperial Parliament. The Colonies were looked upon as expensive appendages of the Crown. They 'hung like a millstone round our neck.' So spoke Disraeli, and his words re-echoed the consistent language of Cobden and the other prophets of the Manchester school. The one responsibility of the Mother Country in respect of its Colonies was 'to ripen these communities to the earliest possible maturity, social, political, commercial; to qualify them by all the appliances within the reach of the parent State for present self-government and *eventual independence* (the italics are mine) is now the universally admitted aim of our Colonial policy.'

[1] Aileen Dunham, *Political Unrest in Upper Canada*, 1815–1836, p. 166. Quoted by Schuyler, *Parliament and the British Empire* (1929), p. 200.

These words are quoted from a thoroughly representative work of that period, Mr. Arthur Mills's *Colonial Constitutions*, published in 1856. Sir George Cornewall Lewis, in his classical *Essay on the Government of Dependencies*, had written to similar effect in 1841. Cobden wrote and spoke even more strongly. Mr. Mills was right: present self-government was the immediate object; 'independence' the ultimate goal, of our policy.

There were, indeed, a few individual exceptions. Lord Durham and his immediate coadjutors, Gibbon Wakefield and Charles Buller, were among them, but perhaps the most notable were Lord Grey in the House of Lords and Sir William Molesworth in the House of Commons.

> I maintain [said Molesworth] that whenever the local circumstances of a Colony will admit the existence of a Colonial Parliament, the Colonial Parliament ought to possess powers corresponding with those of the British Parliament, *with the necessary exception of Imperial powers. For if it were to possess Imperial powers it would become an Imperial Parliament, and as there cannot be two Imperial Parliaments in one Empire, the British Empire would be dissolved.*

And he proceeds to suggest that as the United States is a system of States clustered round a central Republic, so 'our Colonial Empire ought to be a system of Colonies clustered round the hereditary monarchy of England.'[1] But Molesworth's wise words (which I have again ventured to italicise) fell on ears deafened by the din of Manchester—or rather of that Benthamite philosophy with the dogmas of which a great and patriotic city has been so unfairly associated. It should rather be described as the Whitehall school, for the *laissez-faire* policy was sustained, if not inspired, by a succession of Permanent Under-Secretaries of great ability—Sir James Stephen (1836–47), Herman Merivale (1847–59), and Sir Frederick Rogers (1860–71). But what Mr. H. D. Hall justly describes as 'the lowest depth of the separatist movement' was reached by Sir Henry Taylor (also of the Colonial Office), who wrote in the middle 'sixties to his official chief, the Duke of Newcastle: 'In my estimation the worst consequence of the late dispute with the United States has been that of involving this country and its North American provinces in closer relations and a common cause.' Even Whitehall could not have sunk lower than that.

The ascendancy of the separatist school was, however, approaching its end. In 1872 Disraeli, on the eve of his great electoral triumph, announced a complete, though long deferred, recantation of his youthful heresies, and declared that self-government ought to have been conceded to the Colonies only 'as

[1] Molesworth's *Speeches* have been rescued from undeserved oblivion and admirably edited by Professor H. E. Egerton (Oxford University Press, 1903).

part of a great policy of Imperial consolidation.' There ought to have been, in his opinion, substantial innovations, as, for example, 'an Imperial tariff,' but above all there should have been established 'some representative council in the metropolis which would have brought the Colonies into constant and continuous relations with the Home Government.' These were wise words, though too tardily uttered, and almost simultaneously Tennyson made his vigorous protest against the separatist policy in the well-known suffix to the *Idylls of the King*. These were sufficiently significant straws on the surface of the stream; but the Imperialist river was soon in full flood. During the last fifteen years of the century it almost, indeed, overflowed its banks.

The South African War checked its course; not even Mr. Chamberlain could beguile an urbanised and industrialised electorate from its traditional adherence to the dogma of free imports; public interest was again concentrated on domestic politics, and the chart of Imperial temperature showed a steady fall. So marked, indeed, was the fall during the Radical Administrations (1906–14) that the German people were easily led to believe that the first shot fired in a European war would be the signal for the 'dissolution of England's loosely compacted Empire.'

Never was a confident anticipation so dismally disappointed. The first shot fired in the Great War brought the whole Empire into line. Let this, however, be made clear. The active participation of the Dominions in the War was wholly spontaneous and voluntary. Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and the rest were under no obligation to contribute a man or a shilling. But by no action on their part (save a declaration of independence) could the Dominions have remained outside the sphere of belligerency. There was momentary talk of neutrality in South Africa. It was vain talk. Germany was entitled to bombard Capetown on August 5, 1914, as clearly as she was entitled to bombard Scarborough or Deal. When the British Cabinet declared war on August 4, the British Empire was at war. No unit of the Empire could escape its responsibility save by secession: active belligerency, however, was, be it repeated, a different matter.

Nevertheless, splendid as was the response of the Dominions, there was a general feeling, widely expressed, that the thing must not happen again. Policy determines the issues of peace and war. 'We,' said the Dominions, 'find ourselves at war; but we had no part in shaping the policy which preceded it.' The hand that wields the sword of the Empire justly holds the sceptre of the Empire. When the Mother Country alone wielded the one, to her alone belonged the other. When, as to-day, the nations of

[illegible] Mr. Doherty, Minister of [illegible] in Canada, [illegible] the Dominions. Nor was there any answer to his argument. 'Call us to your councils,' said Sir Robert Borden. We called them. Into an Imperial Cabinet they entered.

In that Imperial Cabinet they might have their place to-day, had they chosen to retain it. But no sooner was the sword sheathed, than the Dominions demanded, not *jointly* to sway the one sceptre, but the right to sway separate sceptres. The demand, once made, could not, of course, be refused; it was frankly and fully conceded at the Peace Conference. But at that Conference the Dominions both ate their cake and had it. Their representatives appended their signatories to the Peace Treaties twice—once as members of the British Empire Delegation, and again as representatives of individual 'nations.' On the same terms they entered the League of Nations. Yet Mr. Lloyd George spoke no more than the naked truth when he said (House of Commons, August 18, 1922):

> Supposing they [the Dominions] had been there [at Paris] as separate independent nations owing no allegiance to the British Crown. They would not have had one-fifth of the power and dignity they had as representatives of nations inside the British Empire. . . . If they had been independent nations they would not have sat so high in the Council Chamber. . . . They knew it and they were proud of it.

Nevertheless, the fissure that first revealed itself in Paris has widened, and, unhappily, is widening. In 1917 the Home Government and the Dominions unanimously resolved that the new procedure of the Imperial Cabinet had proved itself 'of such service, not only to all its members, but to the Empire,' that it should henceforward meet annually, or more often if occasion demanded. It has never met since 1918. Nay more: in 1921 the Prime Ministers of the Dominions were invited to take part, in accordance with the resolutions previously adopted, in an Imperial 'Cabinet.' They accepted the invitation; but when they met they ostentatiously disclaimed the term 'Cabinet.' 'I see no incongruity whatever in applying the term "Cabinet" to the association of Prime Ministers and other Ministers who meet around a common council board to debate and to determine the various needs of the Empire.' So said Sir Robert Borden in 1918. But, cordially as I welcomed the experiment of the Imperial War Cabinet, I was not without serious misgivings as to whether an Imperial Executive could permanently exist unless it was based upon an Imperial Legislature. Those misgivings I

expressed at the time in the pages of this Review.[3] [illegible] I lament the unhappy fulfilment of my own prognostications. My chief consolation is that the 'curves' of the centrifugal and centripetal periods have in the past been fairly constant in their alternations.

May we dare to hope that in the Conference of 1926 we reached the lowest point in the post-war centrifugal curve? I subjected the Report of that Conference to a detailed analysis in the pages of this Review[4] some three years ago, but, in view of the fact that we are now on the eve of another Conference, it may be permissible to recall some of the more important resolutions of that Conference and their political sequelæ.

Moreover, it happens that within the last few weeks the literature of the subject has been enriched by the publication of three works of outstanding importance to which I desire to call the attention of all those readers of the *Nineteenth Century and After* who are interested in Imperial affairs.

The Sovereignty of the British Dominions[5] is from the highly accomplished pen of Professor A. Berriedale Keith. This work is the latest of a lengthening series of volumes which have established, beyond cavil or dispute, Dr. Keith's claim to the first place among the authorities on the constitutional law of the British Empire. It has been suggested by the Report of the Imperial Conference of 1926 on Inter-Imperial Relations, and on the extraordinarily varied, not to say contradictory, interpretations which have been placed upon that Report. The Report, as Dr. Keith justly observes, 'has been regarded as a mere authoritative statement of existing facts regarding the Imperial Constitution; it has been extolled as creating for the Dominions a status of sovereign independence which renders secession needless, since there is no bond to sever; and it has been censured for tending to weaken the efficacy of the British Empire as an instrumentality in assuring the peace of the world.' But the remarkable points about that Report—points which, as Dr. Keith says, are constantly ignored—are: first, that it has not been formally approved by any Parliament in the Empire save that of the Union of South Africa; and, secondly, that it has never been communicated to foreign Governments, or, as far as I am aware, been submitted to the League of Nations. There is a third: that, except for one evening's discussion initiated by the present writer on June 29, 1927, it received no attention whatever in the House of Commons. That discussion, brief and unsatisfactory as it was, was important as having elicited from Mr. Amery, then Secretary of State for the

[3] 'British Federalism; a Vanished Dream?' (September, 1917).
[4] 'The Imperial Parliament and the Empire' (September, 1927).
[5] Macmillan & Co. (1929).

[illegible]

Dominions, the only statement on one of the most important documents in the whole history of the Empire ever vouchsafed to the British House of Commons. Dr. Keith takes me to task, albeit with characteristic courtesy, for having mentioned the Report of 1926 in the same breath with Lord Durham's Report. He argues that the treatment of the Report by the constituent Governments and Parliaments of the Empire is conclusive proof that it was not deemed to have effected any fundamental, or indeed any significant, change in inter-Imperial relations.

Let me assure Dr. Keith that I should be only too glad if I could bring myself to agree with him. But I have my misgivings. In the debate already referred to I put to His Majesty's Government a series of rather blunt questions: 'Had there, or had there not, been a change in constitutional relations since November 1926? If there had, should not the Imperial Parliament at least have been informed of the change if not asked formally to sanction it? If there had been a change, what precisely was its nature? Would it affect the prerogatives of the Crown? Would it affect the rights or duties of the Imperial Parliament?' Needless to say that these questions were adroitly parried by the Secretary of State, who maintained that the Conference had merely declared existing rights and had not created new rights. But if that were so, what did the Home Secretary (then Sir W. Joynson-Hicks) mean by words used in the House of Commons on March 15, 1927: 'The Dominions of the Crown, the great self-governing Dominions, are, *certainly since this last Imperial Conference*, coequal with the United Kingdom'? What did General Hertzog, speaking in the Union Parliament of South Africa, mean when he said: 'They had received *from the last Imperial Conference* the acknowledgment by Great Britain of their sovereign national status, *with full abandonment* by the British Government of any claim to control or superior authority . . .'? I specifically pressed the question whether the Dominions had received such an 'acknowledgment.' What precisely did the British Government 'abandon'? And by whom were they authorised to 'abandon' anything? To these questions I have never had an answer. Mr. Bennett, the leader of the Conservative Party in the Dominion Parliament of Canada, referred to the recommendations of the Conference as 'involving what one must pronounce to be *grave constitutional changes.*' What were those grave constitutional changes? Whatever they were, Mr. Bennett deemed them so grave that he moved in the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa that it was not desirable that the Canadian Parliament should be deemed tacitly to have acquiesced in the declarations and recommendations of the Imperial Conference. It was my wish, not fulfilled, to have

[illegible], and opportunity offered, in similar [illegible] Commons.

Shortly after that debate Mr. Amery made a tour through the Dominions and delivered a series of speeches to which, in their collected form, he gave the suggestive title *The Empire in the New Era.* In almost all those speeches special and pointed reference was made to the Imperial Conference of 1926. Did it not then inaugurate a 'new era'? If either Mr. Amery or Dr. Keith have any lingering doubts on this subject I would respectfully refer them to the speech delivered so recently as November 20 by Mr. Blyth, a Minister of the Free State, in the Dublin Parliament, and to the debate which arose thereon in the House of Lords on December 3. The Secretary of State, Lord Passfield, summarised Mr. Blyth's contention as being based on 'the momentous constitutional development' in the position of the Dominions since 1926. That such a development has taken place Dr. Keith would, I am confident, be the first to admit. Does he deny that it is momentous?

No detached observer could have any doubt on this matter, and it is significant that of the three important works to which I have referred, two come from Columbia University, New York. Dr. A Gordon Dewey, the author of *The Dominions and Diplomacy,*[6] though attached to the Department of Public Law in Columbia University, has the additional advantage of being a graduate of McGill University. Dr. Schuyler, whose work is entitled *Parliament and the British Empire,*[7] is Professor of History in the same University (Columbia). Both works have an important bearing on the theme under discussion in this article. Dr. Dewey, as the title of his work implies, is concerned mainly with the external relations of the Dominions, and in particular with those of Canada. Until recently, he writes, 'the most salient feature of the Britannic Question has been what might be termed its "inwardness."' By this rather clumsy term Dr. Dewey means the *quasi*-domestic relations between the Mother Country and the Dominions. He holds that preoccupation with 'inwardness' has resulted in

> marked confusion between the internal and external aspects of the problem. . . . Principles have been fought for and vindicated at Imperial Conferences which would seem to be valid only within the Commonwealth itself, and to which foreign Powers will accord attention merely as suits their own advantage. The efforts of [Colonial] Nationalists to gain recognition among the nations for the discretion which they presume to reserve unto themselves as regards Imperial commitments, have served merely to enhance the anomalies in Dominion status and to set forth more

[6] Longmans, Green & Co. (London, New York, Toronto, 1929).
[7] New York, Columbia University Press, 1929.

clearly the dilemma which would confront the Dominions in the event of a major crisis.

That seems to be admirably said. Several illustrations of the point on which Dr. Dewey insists will occur to anyone who has followed with attention the development of events since the Armistice. The Chanak incident of 1922 brought the whole Empire to the verge of a 'major crisis.' If we had had at Constantinople a less cool-headed and capable representative than Sir Charles Harington the 'major crisis' might well have issued in war. What would the position of the Dominions have been? The attitude of New Zealand and Australia was not in doubt; what would have been the attitude of Canada and South Africa? Happily that question became academic by the passing of the 'incident'; but it might easily recur. Moreover, it is significant that when the Peace Treaty between the Allied Powers and Turkey was ultimately signed at Lausanne (July 1923) the Dominions were not signatories to the document, though the Treaty was supplementary to that of Versailles. The exclusion of Dominion representatives from the Conference and the absence of their signatures to the Treaty unquestionably raised awkward questions, and the comment of Mr. Mackenzie King thereon is noteworthy. Speaking as Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada in the Dominion Parliament on June 9, 1924, he said:

> Legally and technically Canada will be bound by the ratification of this Treaty; in other words, speaking internationally, the whole British Empire in relation to the rest of the world will stand as one when this Treaty is ratified. But as respects the obligations arising out of the Treaty itself, speaking now of inter-Imperial obligations, this Parliament, if regard is to be had to the representations which from the outset we have made to the British Government, will in no way be bound by any obligation beyond that which Parliament of its own volition recognises as arising out of the situation.

That Mr. King's pronouncement was, from the point of view of a parliamentary performance, exceedingly adroit is undeniable; whether his position is either legally tenable or politically satisfactory is more open to doubt.

The Locarno Agreement affords another illustration of the anomaly of the existing situation. It was easy enough for the Imperial Conference to express complacent satisfaction after the event. 'From the standpoint of all the Dominions and of India, there was complete approval of the manner in which the negotiation [at Locarno] had been conducted and brought to so successful a conclusion.' So we read in the Report. That is all very pleasant, but it cuts no ice. The Locarno Pact imposed on Great Britain very grave responsibilities. Under that instrument Great Britain guaranteed existing frontiers between France and

Germany and Belgium and Germany, and undertook to assist in repelling aggression on one side or the other. That guarantee might easily result in (though it is hoped it would avert) a renewal of the Great War. Should that result unfortunately ensue, the whole Empire would, as in 1914, find itself at war. At the Conference of Locarno the Dominions were not represented; they were not individually signatories to the Treaty, but the absence of their signatures cannot legally exempt them (despite the specific and formal exclusion of the Dominions in Article IX. of the Pact) from consequences which might conceivably arise.

It is all very well for us, as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, to draw distinctions between 'active' and 'passive' responsibility, or 'active' and 'passive' belligerency; but what possible right have we to expect that foreign States would respect the distinction, unless it should happen to be convenient to themselves to do so? Great stress has been laid since 1926 upon the doctrine that the King-Emperor must henceforward regard as equal in status, if not in stature, the responsible Executives in the several Dominions (including the United Kingdom), and must act on the advice severally tendered by them, without the interposition of the British Cabinet. That is a very clumsy doctrine and might have very awkward consequences. Suppose that in relation to a particular crisis in foreign affairs contradictory advice were tendered to the Sovereign by the Cabinets of the Dominion of Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia respectively, whose advice is His Majesty to take, whose to reject? The true doctrine was surely stated by Professor J. H. Morgan in his Rhodes lecture on 'Dominion Status' delivered in March 1929. 'Once grasp, he said, 'the significance of the maxim . . . that the "Crown is one and indivisible throughout the Empire," and a great deal of the current use and misuse of the term the "sovereignty" of the Dominions will, in losing half its meaning, lose all its danger.' And as to foreign affairs he added the timely caution that 'matters might be external to particular Dominions without being foreign to the whole Empire.'

An illustration which may have immediate political significance is ready to hand. On February 1, 1924, Mr. MacDonald's first Government accorded recognition to the Soviet Government of Russia. It was done without consultation with the Dominions. Did it, or did it not, bind them? Professor Keith holds that the act of the Imperial Government was 'one which, under international law, clearly bound the whole of the Empire.' Mr. Mackenzie King, on the contrary, declared that 'the Canadian Government would take their own position in regard to the Soviet Republic just as they would take their position in regard to anything else.' As a matter of fact, the Canadian Dominion

did in this instance follow the lead of the Home Government and accord formal recognition to the U.S.S.R. But Dr. Keith holds, and, in my submission, he is right, that Mr. King's action was 'internationally neither necessary nor effective.'

Another point. The claim of the Dominions—or some of them—for separate diplomatic representation in foreign capitals has undoubtedly added a further complication to a situation that is already sufficiently ambiguous. The matter was first raised in an acute form by the refusal of the Canadian Government to allow the British Ambassador at Washington to sign, along with Mr. Lapointe, the Canadian plenipotentiary, the Halibut Treaty of 1923. The refusal was pointed and deliberate. The British Ambassador at Washington, Sir Auckland Geddes, having telegraphed (February 23, 1923) to the Governor-General, 'I have been instructed by His Majesty's Government to sign the Treaty in association with Mr. Lapointe,' Lord Byng replied (February 28), 'My Ministers are of opinion that, as respects Canada, the signature of Mr. Lapointe alone should be sufficient as it affects solely Canada and the United States.' The Treaty was signed on behalf of His Majesty only by Mr. Lapointe. But in the American Senate Canada came up against an obstacle, for the Senate ratified the Treaty as 'a Convention between the United States and *Great Britain*' (March 4, 1923). Canada, however, protested, and in the following year the Senate yielded to Canadian susceptibilities so far as to ratify the Treaty in its original form—*i.e.*, with *Canada* substituted for Great Britain.

In itself the Halibut Treaty possessed only a local significance; but the whole incident—the deliberate affront to His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington, the obstinate insistence of the Canadian Government on his exclusion from all participation in the conclusion of the Treaty—marked an important step towards the affirmation of diplomatic independence on the part of the Dominion of Canada.

The appointment of a permanent Canadian Minister at Washington and the reception of a United States representative at Ottawa were the logical sequel of the action taken by the Canadian Government in reference to the Halibut Treaty. An interchange of Ministers between Ottawa and Paris was the next step; between Ottawa and Tokio is to be the third.

The two weighty tomes on *The Dominions and Diplomacy*, wherein this development is treated *in extenso*, are not out of proportion to its intrinsic importance. It were much to be desired that they should arrest the attention of the British electorate and the Imperial Parliament. But I am not over-sanguine about that. A handful of constitutional experts are already alive to the significance of these developments, but I doubt whether,

beyond that very limited circle, the constitutional evolution of the British Empire is a subject which will excite any profound emotion or even a languid interest. The attention of the House of Commons is at present wholly concentrated, like that of the electorate, on social and industrial problems. Such problems are the inevitable sequelæ of a great war. They cannot be ignored, and a right solution of them is of transcendent importance to the community. Nevertheless, it is deplorable that so little of parliamentary time can be spared for the consideration of constitutional problems of vital significance to the British Commonwealth of Nations. All the greater, then, is the debt which we owe to scholars like Dr. Keith, Dr. Dewey and Professor Schuyler for their efforts to elucidate these problems and to bring them to the attention of politicians and publicists throughout the English-speaking world.

Down to the outbreak of the Great War 'Dominion status' might with sufficient accuracy have been interpreted as meaning the right to exclusive control over the local affairs of the Dominion concerned. The control of the foreign relations of the Empire was by general, if tacit, consent vested in the Imperial Government. But the sentiment of Colonial nationalism was developing apace. Could a 'nation,' even if it formed a unit in the larger whole of a Commonwealth, permanently acquiesce in the restriction of its jurisdiction to internal affairs? Did not nationhood imply control over *all* the affairs of the nation, external as well as internal? But, if so, how was nationhood to be reconciled with membership of an Empire?

The dilemma is not novel. It has confronted, and must necessarily confront, every confederation of States. But it has arisen in a peculiarly acute form in a confederation the constituent States of which are geographically remote from each other. Another consideration must not be ignored. Remote from each other, some of the nations of the British Commonwealth are in close contiguity to States outside the family. Great Britain herself cannot escape the implications of physical contiguity to the European continent, and has gratuitously accepted new specific responsibilities in relation thereto. The Canadian frontier marches with that of the United States. Only the British Navy is interposed between Japan and Australasia. Contiguity must still count for something. Yet year by year the globe is contracting. Physical science is co-operating with moral and intellectual influences to bring about a unification of the world and to enforce the lesson of the solidarity of mankind. The diplomatists of Vienna were sharply censured for ignoring the principles of 'nationality' in the great European settlement of 1815. The

statesmen who presided over the settlement of 1919 have incurred blame for giving an exaggerated emphasis to that very same doctrine. Geneva is already engaged on the task of neutralisin the more obvious defects of their handiwork. 'Nationalism to-day is suspect, and it is the primary function of a League o 'Nations' to minimise its implications. And this is the moment selected for the reassertion of an obsolescent and disintegratin principle in the bosom of an Empire which provides the most powerful instrument yet devised for the maintenance of world peace. The irony of the situation is manifest. Can anything b done to alleviate it? Of the legal links of Empire the only tw which possess much practical validity to-day are the Crown and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The youngest of the Dominions has openly flouted the Privy Council, and its loyalty to the Crown is not above suspicion. The Imperial Conference of 1926 was greatly influenced by a desire to make the Imperial 'yoke' as light as possible for the least loyal of the Dominions. Phrases, undeniably if not designedly ambiguous, were inserted in the Report on Inter-Imperial Relations, in the interests of unanimity and in the hope of reconciling the irreconcilable. The central doctrine of the British Constitution—the sovereignty of Parliament—was seemingly surrendered wit similar intent. Is it worth while? Are we not running a serious risk of poisoning the whole body-politic of the Empire for the sake of saving a diseased limb? Would not amputation be a healthier alternative?

Most ardently do I hope that the ensuing Imperial Conference will take a stronger line than the last with the malcontents. Membership of the British Empire is not an irksome obligation; it is a high privilege. Let those who do not so regard it 'loose the bond and go.' The constituent States which remain within the confederation will be the happier, the Empire as a whole will be the stronger, for a surgical operation which, though painful, and maybe dangerous, is at least preferable to septic poisoning.

J. A. R. MARRIOTT.

THE NATIVE QUESTION IN KENYA

SINCE the publication of the Hilton Young Report much has been heard of the necessity of a common native policy for East Africa. Further, it seems to be thought that such a policy would be easy of realisation did not Kenya, with its white settlers, stand in the way. Kenya is the only one of the territories involved in which one has to reckon with the white settler, the man who is not merely conducting an agricultural or mineral exploitation, but who is making a home. Even so, it is difficult to see how any common denominator can be found between peoples like the Baganda, with their comparatively advanced systems of government and land holding, or the tribes in the Bukoba province of Tanganyika—who go about in motor cars, or at least on cycles—and many of the tribes which are still in the nomadic pastoral stage. But when one gets closer to the problem in Kenya, which in its diversity may almost be regarded as an epitome of all East African conditions, it is clear that the native problem is not one, but several, and, moreover, that its political aspect is negligible in comparison with the economic and social difficulties. At home one is led to think of Kenya as a source of conflict between white man and native; near at hand the anxious question for the Administration is how to maintain the conditions under which the native can continue his accustomed life, even with all the relief he obtains by working for the white man. A mere consideration of the areas involved will show how small a factor the white settler is in the occupation of the Colony. Out of a total area of about 140,000,000 acres some 7,500,000 are reserved for the whites, and about 35,000,000 are defined as native reserves; of the huge remaining area some is forest, but the great part is arid country towards the Abyssinian frontier, that supports a few nomadic tribes, but little or no settlement, either native or white. The protection of this area from slave-raiding is no light burden on the resources of the Colony, because no revenue is collected from its inhabitants. Nor do the white reserves embrace the pick of the country; they consist mainly of the uplands, from 5000 to 10,000 feet in altitude, much of which was formerly sparsely occupied, either because it was colder than the native

tion, or because it was a 'debatable land' subject to the raids of the Masai. It is suitable for European cultivation, and now carries great fields of maize at the lower altitudes, and of wheat or barley from 7000 feet upwards.

Few countries exhibit so much diversity within a short space as Kenya. Starting from the coast—*e.g.*, up the railway line from Mombasa—there is first a coastal belt, tropical in character, but undeveloped because of irregularity of rainfall and lack of permanent water. It contains some sisal plantations, a few sugar estates, and some cocoanut plantations for copra, but in the main it is thinly occupied by native tribes and counts for little in the general economy of the Colony. This is succeeded by a grassy plateau, occupied by the Masai to the south and west of the line, by the Akamba to the north and east. Approaching Nairobi one enters the Athi plains, grazed by the Masai and famous as the great game reserve. From Nairobi the line still mounts, partly through white settlements, partly through the Kikuyu reserve, until the escarpment is reached, and then descends into the great Rift Valley, which traverses Kenya from north to south. The floor of the Rift Valley, hot and dry, is covered with sparse grass and thorn scrub: southward it is Masai country, and joins on to their great reserve; northward is a white settled area of cattle and sheep grazing with considerable cultivation, though at some risk of failure from drought. Here the railway divides; the older southern section climbs rapidly out of the valley to the settled wheat-growing country about Londiani at 9000 feet or so, and thence drops again to the Kavirondo reserve, and once more down an escarpment to the flat tropical shores of the Victoria Nyanza. To the south of the line is another hill area of steep slopes and high rainfall, the Kerico district, where tea is rapidly being developed. The northern section equally climbs rapidly out of the valley to 9000 feet or so, and continues along the Uasin Guisha plateau till it strikes into the North Kavirondo reserve for Uganda. A branch to the north opens up a settled area called the Trans-Nzoia, a purely post-war development, which continues to the high forest land on the flanks of Mount Elgon.

From Nairobi a branch line goes northward through the Kikuyu reserve until it reaches a settled area on the flanks of Mount Kenya, where coffee, maize, sisal, and wheat are all grown.

Conceive, then, a highly accidented country in which one can pass in an hour or two from parched vegetation shimmering in the heat to cool uplands deep in grass that recall the high Cotswolds, where only the dangerous sun warns of the nearness of the equator. The white settlements are closely interwoven with the native

reserves; indeed, much of the white farms is in 'squatter' occupation by natives at work on the farm, but who are given plots of land and grazing for their cattle.

The railway, expensive to construct and to maintain on account of the gradients, serves white and native areas indifferently. The roads are well graded, but, from the lack of good material, develop a treacherous surface and terrible ruts in wet weather. Still, everyone lives in a motor car; and motor cars in Africa go everywhere, track or no track. Rarely are any but American cars to be seen; the British car, depending for its power upon a small engine at high speed, wilts before an African course of potholes and slippery ruts.

In the native reserves feeder roads are being constructed by the local native councils, this being one of the few purposes for which forced labour may still be exacted by order of the chiefs.

The natives of Kenya belong to many different peoples, of various origin and at various stages of development. The languages, even when they possess a common Bantu basis, are distinct, and the *lingua franca* is Swahili—properly the speech of the tribes of Zanzibar and the opposite coast, who used to supply the porters of East Africa. Swahili is taught in the schools, and is used both by settlers and administrative officers, though the latter carry an interpreter when dealing with any particular tribe. Steps are now being taken to initiate the replacement of Swahili by English.

The best known of the tribes is the Masai, long dreaded throughout East Africa for their fighting power, though just before the British occupation they had received some rude checks from tribes they had usually raided at pleasure. They occupy south-eastern Kenya; indeed, their territory was arbitrarily cut in two by the old demarcation of German East Africa, now Tanganyika. A northern section of the tribe was also cut off by white settlement, but by agreement this group was transferred to the main reserve about 1914.

The Masai are a pastoral folk, moving their great herds of cattle and goats across the plains they occupy as the grazing and water serves. Water, indeed, is scarce in the reserve, but two Government boring plants are now at work, and there are good prospects of obtaining water in most districts. The provision of water constitutes the necessary first step towards inducing the Masai to lead a more settled existence. The Masai are good cattlemen; their stock are superior to those of most of the tribes, if only because they select the bulls and castrate the other males, which they are willing to sell for work oxen or slaughter, and to exchange for heifers with other tribes. They eat meat and blood—hence their fine physique; they milk some of the cows,

and to a limited extent prepare 'ghee' for sale. They are thus far ahead of other tribes in regarding cattle as productive material, though, as with the other folk, the standing of a man is measured by the number of cattle and goats he possesses. The Masai themselves do little cultivation, though here and there maize, and even wheat, is being grown by progressive men, and the habit of agriculture is spreading. The great southern game reserve lies in the country of the Masai, who act as faithful wardens of the vast herds which still roam over the plains. It is still possible to drive out from Nairobi after tea and come within a stone's throw of herd after herd of wildebeest, hartebeest, zebra, and the various gazelles, with occasional ostriches and eland. Equally one may find the giraffe among the acacias that dot the floor of the Rift Valley. The Masai respect the game; only on the lions that follow the zebra do the young men blood their spears, being now debarred from their older methods of proving themselves as warriors. Doubtless as the tribe grows the game reserve will have to be restricted and fenced; a charge can then be made for admission to this magnificent natural zoo, the proceeds of which can be used by the native councils for the improvement of roads and water supplies in the rest of the reserve. The railway line south of Nairobi divides the Masai from the Wakamba, in whose country the real native problem of South Africa arises in its intensest form. The Wakamba are equally a pastoral people, though, unlike the Masai, they neither eat nor milk their stock. They do a certain amount of cultivation, and have been famous from of old as smiths and metal-workers. This characteristic shows itself under training in their capacity to become skilled craftsmen; on the white farms they soon learn to drive tractors and deal with machinery. None the less, the great object of the M'kamba man is to accumulate live-stock—chiefly cattle and goats, with a few sheep. They are kept as tokens of wealth and as currency for the purchase of wives, the price of which may range from 90 to 120 goats. Numbers alone count; quality is not regarded. There is no selection, no castration of the excess of males; the breeding is as Nature wills. Save for this one purpose of wife-buying and for their skins when they die, the live-stock serve no economic purpose; the Wakamba will neither kill them nor sell them. 'Money does not breed' is the native axiom, and Wakamba are known to pay Indian traders to keep their money safe for them. Rather than kill for food, a M'kamba man has been found dying of starvation with his herds round him. This cattle-raising would be but an amiable idiosyncrasy were not the numbers growing to such an extent as to become a menace to the continued existence of the tribe, now that multiplication is no longer checked by the raids of the Masai. A recent detailed

census made by one of the veterinary officers of the Colony estimates the number of live-stock in the Kamba reserve as at least three times as great as the land can carry. Over wide areas the vegetation has been wholly removed, the surface has been broken by the goats which eat down to the roots, and on the slopes erosion has begun in its most dangerous form. The hillsides are purple and chocolate, because they have been bared down to the subsoil, and the rate at which the land loses its water is of course cumulative. In this destructive process the goat is the most active agent. It will be recalled how the goat in historic times has destroyed the fertility of Greece and other Mediterranean regions, denuding the hillsides and washing the soil into malarious swamps in the valleys, and this process is rapidly being repeated in East Africa. Some of the Wakamba chiefs are conscious of the ruin that is overtaking their country. They can recall districts where the grazing was good in their youth, but have now become desert; they agree as to the deterioration of the areas that are still carrying cultivation and stock. But they say that their people generally fail to recognise the inevitable end, and are by no means disposed to change their outlook. They will only reduce their stock under compulsion from the Government. The droughts of the last two years have accelerated the destruction and hit the Wakamba hard. So far they seem to have managed to live on food purchased by their hoarded money, though many of them are described as irretrievably in debt to the Indian traders, in spite of the law that voids a debt of more than 200s. unless it has been registered before a District Officer. The Wakamba solution for their troubles is more land. They had previously been given one unoccupied area and are now overflowing into other reserves. But whatever land were available it would only afford a temporary relief; given the opportunity, in time the Wakamba would fill the whole of Africa with their stock.

It is in the Kamba reserve that the worst examples of desert-making are to be seen, but there are other districts equally in danger, where the stock population has been allowed to outgrow the capacity of the land. Practically all the Kenya tribes have the same passion for the accumulation of cattle and goats that serve but a minimal economic purpose until they become skins, and, though the rate of increase is slow owing to endemic diseases, it is quite sufficient to make over-stocking inevitable, even without the efforts of the Veterinary Department to clean up rinderpest in the native herds. There is some irony in the situation. Many people have looked to Africa as the great potential source of meat for the world that has as yet been undeveloped. The cattle are indeed there, even though Africa is the home of every known and unknown cattle disease, but they are unavailable for food

purposes, and they are tending to destroy the land on which they live.

The Masai and the Wakamba are the chief pastoral tribes; other cattle peoples are the Lumbwa, who occupy a small reserve about the southern section of the railway line. Incorrigible cattle-raiders, the Lumbwa have recently attracted attention by a brush with the Masai, a small affair of raid and counter-raid, but which caused some alarm to the isolated tea-planters of the Kericho district between the two fires. Almost as untamed are the Nandi, a tribe occupying a rugged range of hills in the Kavirondo reserve. A tale is told of a District Officer who climbed up to a great platform of rock on the edge of the escarpment overlooking the flat country on the shores of the lake. There he met some Nandi chiefs gazing at settlements of the agricultural tribes below, and asked them what they were looking at. 'Our cattle,' was the bitter response from one old warrior. But most of the peoples of various origin in the Kavirondo reserve are cultivators, and so important has become their production of maize that a branch of the railway is being built to take the traffic. The growth of cotton is increasing yearly; indeed, agriculture generally is improving, the great danger being the spread of *striga*, a weed parasitic on maize which can only be kept under by the most stringent weeding. Ten years ago most of the Kavirondo natives went mother naked; now they are all clothed in cotton-prints bought from the Indian traders and made on Bombay looms. Manchester seems to be too much interested in the politics of the African native to care to clothe him.

There remains one other considerable tribe engaged in agriculture, the Kikuyu, whose reserve runs close in to Nairobi and stretches out to the southern flanks of Mount Kenya, bordering upon and intersected by the white plantations, especially of coffee. The Kikuyu are nearer to the stage of landowning than the other tribes; they have a form of family ownership known as the 'githaka,' and a Commission is now sitting in Kenya to investigate this question of tenure, for several ownership, or at least security of occupation, is here, as elsewhere, the basis of improved farming. In some areas the titles seem to have been derived by agreement with the Wandirobo, a hunter tribe who ranged over the country before the advent of the Kikuyu, but of which the remnants are now pushed back into the Kavirondo country. It is over these ancient rights of cultivation that trouble now exists between the white settlers and the Kikuyu. Some of the areas alienated for white settlement were at the time practically unoccupied because they were subject to Masai raidings. But the Kikuyu have tenacious memories—'The Masai took our cattle and our wives, but never our land'; and

whether or not some of these old claims have much foundation, the fact remains that there are landless Kikuyu with no right to a share in any 'githaka.' These men, when they cannot get a squatter tenancy on a white farm, complain that their own headmen drive hard bargains for the use of a patch of land. The Kikuyu have readily adopted the machinery of white civilisation; they are the politicals of East Africa, and they enjoy litigation. It is not unknown that a dispute over the exact number of goats paid for the grandmother of the family should reach the appeal courts. With their quick intelligence, the Kikuyu early became a favoured field for mission work, but feelings are no longer so cordial. The young Kikuyu are putting in claims for the lands held by the missions, and in their zeal for 'nationalism' are reviving barbarous customs like female circumcision, frowned on alike by missions and the Administration. Recently they broke up the Communion service in a certain church, some members of which had been excluded because of their participation in a particularly cruel case of clitero-dectomy that had come into the courts. The Kikuyu are experimenting a little in new religions, blends of Christianity and Mohammedanism, but none of their sects has reached the importance of the Amalekites in Uganda. The Kikuyu are good cultivators, and are rapidly improving their agriculture. They are keen about the improved maize varieties the agricultural officers distribute, and they are beginning to grow European vegetables. Indeed, an export trade in potatoes with India is being developed, thanks to an inspection and grading system which the Department of Agriculture has established at Mombasa. Like the other tribes, the Kikuyu accumulate cattle and goats. To some extent the cows are milked; the goats are useless and destructive until they are dead. But the worst effects of erosion are being avoided among the Kikuyu, because they have taken generally to the planting of wattle on the steeper and poorer land. Wattle grows quickly and, besides firewood, provides a source of income from the bark, which is sold to the factories that make from it an extract for tanning. Carrying in firewood and water constitutes the most terrible *corvée* of the Kikuyu women. From their earliest childhood they are trained to bear heavy loads, not on their heads, as do the stately Baganda women, but on their backs, supported by a strap round the forehead. They are proud of their powers, but the doctors tell of the disastrous effect upon childbearing. There are a number of smaller tribes, like the Somali, the Giriami, and other coastal tribes; but enough has been said to show how remote from the actual circumstances is the idea of a common native policy. The one thing on which the tribes feel intensely is the possession of their land, and that is

[illegible] in the native reserves. The ultimate aim of the Administration must be to build up a system of individual occupation for agriculture. To do this demands infinite patience and sympathy, a stage-by-stage development adapted to the conditions and starting-point of each tribe. Though in each tribe individuals learn with astonishing rapidity—evidence of good material that has hitherto had little chance in a world rendered unstable by war, famine, and disease—yet the tribe as a whole can only move slowly. Above all, the measures must be informed with sympathy and understanding, for a native people will wither away if its customs are so changed as to deprive its members of their zest in life. Certain immediate measures will have to be taken to reduce the number of live-stock, and here compulsion will be necessary, though the edge can be taken off by an intensive campaign of education. Otherwise the Government will soon be faced with the feeding of the Wakamba people and their stock; indeed, another drought would at once necessitate such action. This first step will be costly enough, for the stock to be culled have little or no commercial value as meat. A factory is needed which in the first instance will turn out little more than fertiliser and skins; later, as improvement in the stock sets in, the output of meat products will grow and the operation will become normal trading. Coupled with this initial relief should be the education of the pastoral tribes in economic methods of stock-keeping and regulated grazing to improve the pasturage. Somehow the outlook of the tribes upon live-stock has got to be changed; if the Wakamba, for example, could be led to eat even a quarter of a pound of meat per head per week, their over-stocking problem would disappear, and the physique of the tribe would improve with the more varied dietary.

With the improved pastoralism should come an increasing amount of cultivation, for stock alone are never able to support a large population. This eventually means settlement and security of occupation, though this stage is still remote among the Masai and the Wakamba. But as leading in the right direction comes the development of water supplies and roads, both costly, and demanding, therefore, an increase in the earning capacity of the tribe.

Amongst the agricultural tribes progress can be more rapid; indeed, they have already learnt much from working on the European farms. There they acquire a higher standard of living and earn money to pay for it; the coffee-planters alone pay out about 250,000*l*. a year in wages. Their dietary is better; they learn by practice better methods of cultivation and the use of implements and manure. The native hand tools have been replaced by the more effective European hoes, ploughs are becom-

ing widespread, and improved seed and new varieties of crops are appreciated. Throughout the native reserves millets have generally been replaced by maize; wheat is increasing where the climate permits of its growth—for the women have learnt that their children thrive better on wheat porridge than on maize—and European vegetables are being cultivated. Better farming is now a matter of education, for which the natives are quite ready. But it is an all-round education that is necessary—not just the teaching of reading and writing that leads to the production of clerks. To quote from the Report of the recent Commission on Agriculture in Kenya:

> The improvement of native agriculture is closely bound up with the general problem of raising the physique, the health and the education of the natives. An ill-balanced dietary, especially at early ages, reduces the physique of the natives and renders them more susceptible to the prevalent diseases—parasitic worms, malaria and tuberculosis. Better food, better housing, better personal hygiene, are all bound up in one cycle with better agriculture, and it is impossible to say that improvement should begin at any one point rather than another. Sir Horace Plunkett's dictum—'Better farming, better business, better living'—is as true of African as of European cultivators.

One other question is of importance in the development of native agriculture, especially as regards its relation to the white farmer, and that is the organisation of marketing. At present the natives sell to the Indian traders, whose 'dukas' permeate the remotest districts. It is difficult to exaggerate the value the Indian traders have been to the young community, their convenience and their efficiency—but it is no more than human nature for them to buy cheap—when purchasing small parcels of agricultural produce. They buy, too, at a flat rate, irrespective of quality, and this does not encourage the producer to improve his output. The matter does not end with the indifferent return to the native; wherever the material is equally grown by the white farmer, the Indian traders, after bulking their purchases, are in a position to undersell the white producer. So is renewed the root trouble of agricultural production the world over; prices are pegged back to the minimum that will maintain production from the men with the lowest standard of living, who themselves are kept at the bare subsistence level. What is needed is the patient cultivation of co-operative societies among the natives, which will ensure to them the current market price, less the necessary costs of grading, bulking and transport. The co-operative organisation becomes at once an educational agency, because its interest is to inform its members what they ought to grow in order to secure a good sale. Further, the native co-operatives can then associate themselves with the white co-operatives

...order to obviate competition and ensure common marketing ...export. Already one of the most successful of the Kenya ...operative societies, the Lumbwa Creamery, takes in native ...mbers on the same terms as white, and though after an initial ...ccess there has been a setback, owing to the absence of the ...istrict Officer who organised the natives, the work is being taken ... again.

If the natives can thus be led to develop economically we may ...e an end to the estrangement that threatens to develop between ...em and the white settlers. Undoubtedly there is a vocal, and ...ssibly dangerous, element among the Kikuyu, who are a poli...cally minded folk with an instinct for exploiting grievances. ...e young malcontents are well coached by the revolutionary ...ction among the Indians, and have even managed to make touch ...ith the Russian wellhead of discontent. Numerically they are ...nimportant, and they are just as much a nuisance to their own ...iefs as to the whites, for their quarrel is against all authority. ...ut they are accorded an undeserved prominence by a certain ...ction at home, whose passion for 'justice' expresses itself in a ...rofound distrust of their own people. In England, too, we have ... reckon with the incurable romantics who want to see the noble ...vage preserved from the contagion of civilisation. Civilisation ...s, indeed, its ugly side, but it is idle to deny our birthright; ...an, even primitive man, will move along the lines of Western ...evelopment, and it is no more possible to keep the tribes ...nspotted from the world than to maintain Kenya as a game ...serve. Meantime, these friends of the native at home are able ... exert a paralysing influence upon government. By newspaper ...ticles, by questions in the House, they can make the Colonial ...ffice nervous, and needed legislation is hung up until the adminis...ator on the spot who has given years of anxious thought to the ...roblem becomes sick at heart.

Meantime, the repercussion upon the Kenya settlers is ...ngerous. They are conscious of having done a great work of ...lonisation in a very short time, and that they have been the ...ief agents in lifting the natives some steps above their original ...rbarism. And yet they find themselves distrusted and ...nounced as land robbers and sweaters of labour, addicted to ...e cruelties of the old slaveowners. It is true that foul cases ...ve been reported from time to time. Unhappily, all men ...nnot be entrusted with power over the weak; amongst our ...wn folk brutalities of men towards women, and women towards ...ildren, are not unknown, but are left to the law to deal with ...d not regarded as branding the whole of our people.

Small wonder, then, that the Kenya settlers take these imputa...ons to heart and resent them bitterly. That would matter

little did not the resentment engender among them a suspicion of all movements intended to raise the status of the native, and so strengthen the minority who would import from South Africa the Boer attitude to the native. At present the ordinary Kenya settler is on excellent individual terms with the natives who work on his farm ; a reputation for oppression or brutality can be easily earned and would dry up his labour supply.

There are no mines in Kenya, no big exploitations that put the native under unnatural conditions approaching serfdom. Native and white man alike have one outlet—agriculture—and can move hand in hand together towards a mutual understanding in the prime task of making the land productive.

In Kenya there is no fundamental cleavage between white man and native. The native reserves are assured ; there can be no alienation of land in them for white settlers No power can be exercised to force natives to labour on white farms ; even the economic pressure of the hut tax of 20s. a year is a small factor compared with the desires of the native to earn money to gratify his new-found wants. The other basic principle of eventual electoral rights of the native on an educational and property franchise has been repeatedly affirmed by responsible British statesmen, though for the present the question has no actuality in view of the insignificant number of natives who could become qualified on any such franchise and the fact that the Colony is not self-governing. The real native problems are economic, and not political ; they are to a large extent local and detailed questions only known to the men on the spot. However much the Home Government has to be jealous of its trusteeship of the native, it cannot supervise the operations of government in Africa in the meticulous fashion it is asked to do. Some freedom must be given to the Administration, some responsibility entrusted to the settlers. If these men are always treated as incapable of rendering justice to the native, the result will be that greatest of all injustices—leaving the native to himself and his own misery.

After all, administrators and settlers are Englishmen, known for a spirit of fairplay, and the breed does not change by transplantation to Kenya.

DANIEL HALL.

EMPIRE SETTLEMENT

It is generally thought by politicians and others in Great Britain that one of the most hopeful plans for relieving unemployment is to encourage emigration to the overseas Dominions of the Empire, the idea being that the emigrants should take up land and engage in farming. To this end several schemes have been tried, but so far with little success.

Many are much puzzled to account for the comparative failure of these schemes. They argue that there are large areas of fertile land in these Dominions, the development of which is being kept back only by lack of settlers, or, in other words, by shortage of labour, while at the same time Great Britain has a large surplus of labour. What more natural and reasonable, they say, than to transfer those who cannot obtain employment at home to other parts of the Empire where labour is so urgently needed?

Besides disposing of surplus labour in Great Britain, it is argued that the work of the settlers in new parts of the Empire will create new wealth which will result in an improved market for the goods which Great Britain manufactures. To quote from a recent article in this Review by Dr. L. Haden Guest:

> An expanding market in the Dominions created by the work of settlers upon the unused natural resources of these countries, an expanding market in the Colonies, an expanding market in India, these are the new factors which can break the vicious circle of low wages, unemployment, low purchasing power, and low wages again in this country, and enable the process of industrial reorganisation to be carried out on the basis of high wages and high standards instead of on the basis of insufficiency.

Why is it that, in spite of these arguments, there has been so little response to the schemes of emigration which have been tried so far? The answer to this question lies in the fact that at the very base of the above line of reasoning there is a fallacy which renders the whole argument unsound.

It seems to be universally realised that in the industrial world the crying need is for larger markets; demand lags far behind possible supply. But what is not so generally understood is that agriculture is in exactly the same plight. The arguments of those who wish to encourage migration are based on the pleasant

assumption that the demand for agricultural products is unlimited, but in point of fact it is no more unlimited than the demand for industrial products. The development of unsettled areas of agricultural land in different parts of the Empire *is not being held back by lack of settlers, but by lack of demand for the commodities which these lands are capable of producing.*

In industry the lack of sufficient demand results in low wages and unemployment, but in agriculture it results chiefly in low prices. Strictly speaking, there cannot be unemployment in the farming occupation. Farmers always have plenty of work to do, but what they may and often do lack is an adequate return for their work. This seems so obvious that it would hardly be necessary to point it out were it not that many seem to fail to realise it. Because there is no unemployment in agriculture, and because there is a considerable amount of vacant land, it is assumed that agriculture can absorb a large number of persons. As a matter of fact, there are already too many engaged in farming for the well-being of the industry.

Ever since the war period ended agriculture has been stifled by over-production—over-production which has been and still is continually lowering prices below the cost of production; indeed, the only check on production is low prices. This is true not merely of one or two kinds of farm produce, but of every kind. Take, for instance, a staple commodity, wheat. From 1921 to 1924 the world was over-supplied with wheat, with the result that the price fell so low that even experienced and established farmers were thrown on their beam ends, and many others were completely ruined and had to give up farming. In 1924 a short world crop caused prices to rise sharply, and immediately the brake of low prices was released production began to increase at a rapid rate, with the result that as production increased prices fell, until in 1928 ruinously low levels were again reached. Farmers are afraid to think what prices might have been this season had not the partial failure of the Canadian wheat crop and poor prospects in Australia and Argentina relieved the situation and caused a rise in prices. The world market for pork, beef, dairy produce, eggs, etc., is in the same precarious condition, and farmers are becoming more and more convinced that what their industry needs is a curtailment rather than an increase in production.

To all this it may be objected that the Dominions themselves have all along favoured the bringing in of settlers, and that surely those who are on the spot must know the conditions in their own country. The answer to the objection is simply this. The wish for immigration on the part of the Dominions has really come from the business and industrial interests, which

undoubtedly have an unduly large influence with the Dominion Governments—or at least with some of them—while the farmers, not realising the effect which increased immigration was likely to have on their industry, have for the most part remained passive. Manufacturers and business men in the Dominions, like those in the Old World, are looking out to enlarge their markets, and their idea in encouraging immigration was that their home market would improve with the increase in population. Not being themselves engaged in farming, they failed to understand conditions on the farms, although living on the spot, and they were blinded by what they believed to be their interests. At the present time there are not wanting signs that they are beginning to find out their mistake, though they have not yet reached the point where they are willing to admit it. What is bringing about the change of ideas more than anything else is the fact that the effect of the scheme of bringing in new settlers is reacting like a boomerang on the heads of those who were behind it. A considerable number of the immigrants, finding no real opening on the farms, have drifted into the cities, and are causing an unemployment question of some gravity. The writer is at present farming in Western Canada, and has in mind local conditions, but there is little doubt that things are not very different in other parts of the Empire.

If people in Great Britain knew how different farming in Canada really is from what it is represented to be by interested parties they would understand better the reason for the failure of migration schemes. The returns from farming here are such that a farmer with not less than a half-section (320 acres) of land, horses, stock, and equipment fully paid for, and with no large debts, provided he has fair crops (by no means a certainty), can make a decent living. But when his labour (from eleven to fifteen hours a day in summer; and most farmers are far from idle in the winter), his skill in farming and farm management, and his considerable capital investment are taken into account the returns are quite inadequate. When the employers of labour in any particular industry pay their employees low wages and work them long hours it is certain either that the industry in question is yielding poor returns or that the employees are being cheated by their employers. Farm labourers are the poorest-paid workers in Canada, and they work the longest hours. Yet there is no reason to think that the farmers are paying them less than they can afford.

If, on the other hand, the farmer has large annual payments to make on land or mortgage, horses, machinery, etc., he is certain to have a hard struggle extending over a long period of years, and in the end may fail and find himself as poor as when he

started. If to heavy liabilities is added inexperience, his chances of success are, in the opinion of the writer, almost nil.

Probably people in the British Isles do not know that there are in Canada many young men born in the country—farmers' sons and others with farm experience—who would like to start farming if they saw any reasonable chance of success, and there is certainly something rather anomalous in bringing in and assisting settlers from the Old Country with no experience while ignoring those who are already in the country. The Soldier Settlement Scheme is a good example of what land settlement schemes are likely to come to. Although it might be denied in some quarters, that scheme, enormously expensive as it was, and in spite of the fact that the soldier settlers had far more assistance than is now offered to settlers, and in most cases some experience of farming and of the country, cannot fairly be said to be anything else but a failure. The Canadian Government would hardly venture on another such scheme. Perhaps it is worth mentioning that a number of those who have been brought to Canada from the British Isles under the Empire Settlement Scheme have been placed on the very farms which have been abandoned by soldier settlers.

It has to be remembered that although there is a considerable amount of undeveloped land suitable for agriculture in the Empire this land is not the best. Most of the raw land left in Canada, for instance, is largely covered with scrub, which would have to be cleared (an expensive undertaking), or marshy land, which needs draining (a still more expensive business), or is so far north as to make farming very hazardous. If the land is vacant it is only because so far no one in Canada has thought it worth while trying to farm on it, and to attempt to put inexperienced settlers on such land would be simple cruelty. No doubt this land will be settled in course of time, but it will be done gradually, and principally by experienced farmers with at least some capital.

One point remains to be dealt with. It is often stated in newspapers—Canadian and British—that Canada is in a very prosperous state and that farmers here are doing well. That the inhabitants of the cities and towns in Canada are on the whole prosperous is a fact, though some think that they are so largely at the expense of the farmers. But statements alleging that Canadian agriculture is in a prosperous and thriving condition are simply not true.

To repeat what has been stated in the earlier part of this article. The factor which prevents the development of vacant lands in different parts of the Empire is not lack of labour, but a lack of demand for the commodities which that land is capable of producing, to which may be added the fact that much of the

land requires considerable labour and capital to bring it under cultivation.

If, for the sake of the argument, the present attempts to place settlers from Great Britain on such lands did succeed, the result would be to transfer the burden of surplus labour from industry to agriculture, which, as has been already pointed out, is even now bearing its own burden of surplus labour in the shape of over-production, with its resulting low prices for farm products.

Even supposing it were possible to bring this about, no fair-minded man would suggest that it would be a right, and no sensible man would think that it would be a wise, thing to do.

CYRIL M. WINTER.

Northfield Farm,
Lanigan,
Sask., Canada.

THE COST OF LITIGATION

To go to law, as the phrase runs, is a proceeding which fortunately falls only to the lot of a small proportion of the population. It is both troublesome and expensive, but it is an abnormal occasion in the life of the ordinary man, as much as an operation for appendicitis or the breaking of a limb. In each of the latter cases a person incurs expense and suffers pain. The litigant is more fortunate, for, though he incurs expense, he does not suffer pain. When one pays a heavy doctor's bill, or the large fee of a medical specialist, grumbling occurs, but, reluctantly as these persons are paid, there is no actual complaint.

It may therefore be asked why is there, it may be intermittently, a public protest against the cost of litigation? The reason appears to be that the person—whether an incorporated body or an individual—who complains does so because he has a feeling that he is not being treated justly. He has suffered an injury, or he is defending himself against a wrong, or seeking to assert a civil right, and he resents incurring great expense in order to obtain justice.

A popular idea exists that lawyers make large profits from litigation, but it is not the most satisfactory side of a solicitor's business, and if the wills of lawyers of either branch of the profession are examined year by year, it will be found that the amounts left by deceased lawyers do not exceed, even if they equal, the estates left by men who have passed their lives in other work. The average incomes of barristers and solicitors are not greater than those of doctors, architects, engineers, and men of business.

It must be recognised that legal work should be reasonably remunerated, and when the time occupied in conducting a lawsuit is considered, the cost of overhead charges and expenditure on such items as copying, and a reasonable profit for the person who is primarily responsible for the conduct of a case, it is obvious that to go to law must cost a substantial sum of money.

Admitting this proposition, the question must still be asked whether there are any means by which litigation in the High Court can be made less costly than it is to-day.

[illegible] portions of the subject are commented on from time to time is not surprising, but it can only be adequately considered if it is reviewed as a whole and in its relations to the actual process of litigation.

The first point which seems to require notice is the incidence of the court fees (148 in number) in considering the cost of litigation. In 1922 and 1924 the fees were increased, increasing at the same time the cost of litigation. In a bill of costs they do not fill so large a space as the actual working costs, but they are a substantial portion, especially if the case is one of some length.

In an ideal state courts of law would be open without expense to litigants, but the practice of charging court fees has now become firmly fixed, and the most that can be expected is that these fees should be as little burdensome as possible to the litigant. That the increase in 1922 and 1924 tends to depress litigation, especially in respect of small amounts, cannot be doubted, and one change which is required is that, if possible, there should be some relation between the amount at stake and the amount of the fees.

The cost of a writ to commence an action is 1*l.* 10*s.*, and is the same whether the claim is for 200*l.* or 2000*l.* Again, for setting down a case for trial the fee is 2*l.*, and the amount is the same on a judgment; in both cases the fee has no reference to the amount awarded or to the importance of the case. It should also be borne in mind that the payment of a court fee requires the attendance of a solicitor's clerk, and thus the multiplication of small fees increases the actual working charges. To diminish the number of fees and, where a judgment is for a sum of money, to institute a percentage charge would lessen the cost of litigation.

The subject is one of difficulty, for there is much litigation, especially in the Chancery Division of the High Court, which does not aim at obtaining a judgment in pounds, shillings and pence, as, for instance, when it is sought to obtain an injunction to prevent a person or company from doing some act alleged to be injurious to the plaintiff. It might, therefore, be necessary to have some division of fees to cover both classes of cases. The subject is also made more troublesome since the interests of litigants and the interests of the Treasury are acutely opposed; but if the former are squeezed too severely they will seek to have their differences decided outside the law courts. A sensible layman is usually, where the issue depends on a question of fact, as satisfactory a tribunal as a jury, and the English temperament is such that there are many laymen who will decide a case in which no points of law arise with complete satisfaction to the parties. The tendency towards arbitration is increased by the multiplica-

tion of charges such as court fees not less than by the satisfaction with which finality in litigation is regarded by laymen.

Closely connected with court fees is the increase of expense caused by the multiplicity in modern practice of affidavits of a formal character which have necessarily to be sworn and filed. This multiplicity of documents which are supposed to be of a solemn character tends to discredit sworn testimony generally. The most striking example is the so-called affidavit of documents, which might equally well be a signed and unsworn statement; but there are numerous occasions on which a written statement would be as effective as a sworn statement. The fact that witnesses are not sworn in an arbitration is a strong ground for an alteration in the practice in the High Court in regard to affidavits. It would, however, be quite misleading to allow any layman to suppose that an alteration of the fees, or the practice in regard to affidavits and other documents, is easy at the present time. Technicalities embodied in a legal system are not easily dislodged, and reform can only be accomplished by a competent committee having as its objective, not mere formal changes, but a thorough modernisation of the present system in regard to the matters to which reference has just been made.

One cause of complaint among all classes of litigants is the fact that a successful party, though he is by a judgment given his costs, does not receive them in full. This fact rankles in the minds of successful litigants, and has become so well known as to incline those who would enter on litigation to submit to some amount of loss rather than incur a certain expense. It produces also in the community generally a definite sense of injustice in the course of litigation. This diminution of the actual costs incurred in a lawsuit by a successful litigant arises from what is known among lawyers as the taxation of costs. The germ of the practice will be found in a statute passed in the year 1605, intended to prevent dishonest lawyers from preying on clients and charging them excessive fees and making other unnecessary demands, and it gave the client a right to proceed against them in respect of these abuses. From this simple beginning the modern practice has grown up. The principle of it is admirable, since the intention is that the successful litigant should receive from his opponent all his reasonable costs, and that the unsuccessful litigant should be protected from excessive charges. In practice this ideal is not attained, for the taxation of costs as between party and party has now become so technical, and in regard to what are called discretionary charges so uncertain, that many expenses which from a common-sense point of view are reasonable are disallowed. 'Whether,' wrote Bentham, 'the party shall receive reimbursement at the expense of the loser depends upon a thousand capri-

clear and consistent rules." These words, if modified, would be applicable to-day.

According to the *Judicial Statistics* for 1929, the amount of bills arising out of actions and similar matters in the Chancery Division lodged for taxation in the Supreme Court Taxing Office was 616,169*l*., and of this amount 525,754*l*. was allowed. In other figures, 90,415*l*. was disallowed and had to be paid by the successful litigants themselves. In the King's Bench Division the respective amounts were 618,373*l*. and 438,215*l*.; 180,158*l*. had therefore to come out of the pocket of the successful party, or more than one-fourth of the amount claimed. Some part of this probably consisted of unreasonable or extravagant charges, but the larger portion comprised, no doubt, sums a litigant would regard as reasonable expenditure. That taxations as between party and party fail to do full justice is demonstrated by the fact that there is another well-known and more liberal scale, that of a taxation 'between solicitor and client.'

In actions brought against a public authority, if the latter is successful, judgment for the defendant carries costs 'as between solicitor and client'; and the same scale is occasionally allowed by the judges in the Chancery Division in some special cases, a jurisdiction arising from the general and inherent authority of the Lord Chancellor, which passed to the Chancery judges. Of this discretionary power the records of the Court of Chancery show many instances.

It would be both undesirable and impossible to discuss technical details in these pages, but the present state of things in regard to costs may be illustrated by a single example.

By a rule of the Supreme Court a fee for a retainer—that is, a fee to retain a counsel for an approaching trial—is not allowable in a taxation between party and party; in a 'solicitor and client' taxation the taxing master has discretion to allow this fee. Obviously, if a litigant desires to be sure of obtaining the services of a particular counsel, it is a reasonable thing to retain him and to pay the usual fee. To say that in no case shall such a fee be reasonable as part of the costs of a successful litigant is equally and obviously unjust. Again, the bill of costs which is brought in for taxation can only commence with the issue of the writ, except that a 'letter before action' is allowed, an allowance comical in its limitations. For no lawsuit really begins with the issue of a writ; there are always some preliminaries, consultations with and letters to and from solicitors, if not letters to and interviews with opponents. Why, asks the man in the street, is the successful litigant not to obtain the costs of these as part of his expenses as much as the costs from the time when and after the

writ is issued? From a business point of view nothing can be advanced in favour of the present practice.

A more real indemnity of the successful litigant would complete the gradual extension of the principle of the Civil Law, *in expensarum causa victus victori condemnandus est*—that is, the vanquished litigant has to pay the costs—a principle which, as Professor Holdsworth has shown,[1] only made its way into the Common Law by degrees, and which is still not sufficiently carried out. The conclusion to which any fair-minded individual, whether layman or lawyer, who considers this subject will come is that the whole of the regulations as to costs, and the decisions and practice on them, should be scrapped and a new scale and rules should be issued. In other words, the taxation of costs should in all cases and in every Division of the High Court be based on a view of what is reasonably payable by a client to a solicitor in respect of the expenses of the litigation from beginning to end. To obtain any such new scale and rules it would be necessary that, as in the case of court fees, the task should be accomplished by a small committee mainly composed, for this particular purpose, of solicitors, who are the only persons who are in daily contact with this special side of litigation, and who will endeavour to modernise the present system.

Modernisation was the aim of the late Lord Gorell's Committee, which was appointed by the Admiralty in 1909 chiefly to revise the Prize Court Rules. The modernisation of the practice was boldly faced, and in the first Report of the Committee (March 24, 1910) it was stated that 'the existing rules embody a practice which is in our opinion quite unsuited to modern conditions. In revising these rules we aim at bringing the practice of the Prize Court into line as far as possible with that of the Admiralty Court.' The work of this Committee, which was long and successfully tested in the Great War, though it sustained some hostile academic criticism and was objected to by the Government of the United States, is referred to here because it is a precedent for the manner in which a stringent revision of the present system of the so-called taxation of costs should be conducted.

An undue amount of attention has been given to the large fees of a few prominent barristers. Among physicians, surgeons, engineers, are some specialists whose fees are very large, but these do not represent the earnings of the majority of any of these professions. It is the same with the Bar. That the general rate of fees is higher now than it was twenty-five years ago is certain, but so are the charges in every calling and business, and it is by no means clear that the fees of barristers as an entire body

[1] *History of English Law*, iv., p. 336.

have increased in the same proportion as the charges of those who are engaged in other walks of life. In exceptional cases exceptional payments may reasonably be made to exceptional advocates, and when these fees become known there is an inclination in the public mind to estimate general legal remuneration by them, and thus quite wrong impressions are formed. In some instances, it is true, the expenses of an action are out of proportion to the matter at stake, and this is the chief justification for the system of the taxation of costs, especially at a time when limited companies fill so large a part of the field of litigation. To them litigation, though troublesome, is not of the same financial importance as it is to private individuals.

But there is one practice in regard to the Bar which cannot be justified even though it has been judicially approved, that a junior should be paid one-third of the amount of his leader's fee. The leader is paid a fee which he is regarded as being worth, and the fee to the junior should be fixed on the same principle. If a change were made in this respect, it would alter a fixed practice, of which no one knows the origin, which from a common-sense point of view cannot be justified and prejudices the legal profession in public opinion. Yet it is doubtful if the change would have much practical result, for the present proportion is often a fair enough standard of remuneration, and if a more elastic system of taxation were established the present rather standardised scale of fees to junior counsel for work done in chambers should be replaced by one which takes more account of the actual work performed. In any case, whatever tends to cheapen litigation tends at the same time to increase it, and at any rate the moral value of a practice more in harmony with the ordinary principles of employment would be valuable.

When the cost of litigation in all its aspects is impartially considered it is impossible to find means by which it can be made cheap, though it may be made less costly. Litigation will always be an abnormal occurrence, and as lawyers have, like other professional persons, to be adequately remunerated for their work, the litigant must continue to incur considerable expense. But this does not mean that the present cost may not be reduced and its incidence placed on a more satisfactory footing. If the litigant be successful, according to the now accepted principles of English law, he should not have to pay any costs that he has incurred which are reasonable from a business point of view. From this the result follows that the unsuccessful litigant may have to pay more costs than he does at present, for now he escapes paying charges which he ought to bear. A diminution in costs should therefore be to the advantage rather of the unsuccessful than of the successful litigant, who, under a modern system of

taxation, should not have to bear the many charges which he now has to pay.

But a consideration of the subject of litigation necessarily leads an inquirer to the important and difficult subject of the procedure of the High Court, of which the present rules became law nearly half a century ago—in 1883. Amendments have been made in them from time to time, though in this age of change they remain almost untouched, and they are entombed in an intolerable mass of glosses, composed of judicial decisions, notes, and official directions. A simplification of procedure, a return to the original intention of those who were responsible for the Judicature Acts and Rules in the light of modern movements, and expectations, might, apart from other advantages, result in reducing the cost of litigation. But such a simplification must necessarily take many months to carry out, and cannot, therefore, for a long time affect the incidence and expense of a resort to the High Court.

Moreover, however desirable improvements may be, it is useless to overlook the fact that litigants, whether private individuals or corporations, are isolated units without collective power. Discontent of persons or of limited companies does not in itself constitute a driving force, and such public action as exists is towards the employment of justiciable machinery outside the law courts rather than towards the improvement of their procedure, so that legal changes depend, not on public action, but on official energy at a time when high officials have their attention occupied by many more pressing and more popular subjects.

E. S. Roscoe.

THE BADGER AND HIS REPUTATION

Wind-bitten beech with badger barrows,
Where brocks eat wasp-grubs with their marrows,
And foxes lie on short-grassed turf,
Nose between paws to hear the surf
Of wind in the beeches drowsily.
(MASEFIELD.)

THE natural history of the badger, or, more directly, the task of describing the strange animal and its stranger ways, constitutes a problem that has severely taxed the ingenuity of more than one student of animal life. Old writers appear to have known curiously little about this shy, solitary inhabitant of our quiet hillsides and valleys, the sturdy, ancient and eminently characteristic British beast, who, entrenched within his stoutly defended and often impregnable fortress, has defied the worst that man can devise against his race all down the ages. How often, one wonders, has it occurred to the casual observer who comes across an ancient badger stronghold that he is actually looking upon one of the most ancient 'castles' in the world? The antiquarian, and even the ordinary tourist, will journey many miles to inspect some historic fortification—usually an outstanding hill overlooking wide vistas of 'England's green and pleasant land,' as often as not crested with age-old pines, and still encircled with ramparts thrown up at some period of the dim past by the earliest sturdy defenders of our soil. They note with interest the mighty embankments—the same earth into which arrows and javelins once plunged—now carpeted with heather and honeycombed with rabbit-burrows, or the silent, grass-grown trenches, manned long ago by Saxon bowmen, now patrolled nightly by owls and foxes. The imaginative mind can conjure up almost any picture of bygone ages in such a place, and yet, as likely as not, if they care to step aside a little way from the beaten path, fancy will no longer be needed to bring them into direct touch with ancient history, for there they will come upon earthworks unmentioned in guide-books, still defended by a race as unconquerable and almost as old as the hills themselves. There they are on the steepest slope, gleaming white and yellow among the patriarchal pines or beeches, and there they have been as likely as not for

untold ages, modelled and remodelled from time to time, abandoned, perhaps, for a century and again reoccupied by descendants as stout-hearted and conservative in their crude but effective methods of warfare as the badgers who pricked their ears at the tramp of the Saxon sentinels above them, or looked out with wonder at the glare of the Roman camp fires.

> Many a banished year and age,
> And tempest's breath, and battle's rage

have broken down dynasties, changed and repopulated his native land, yet in many cases the ancient strongholds of the badger, entrenched deep in the very heart of the soil, remain impregnable to this day, and there are innumerable places where his human enemy, though aided by every modern contrivance, still assails him in vain.

Every detail concerning the history and life of so old an inhabitant should be common knowledge. Our forefathers, one would have thought, must have known him well enough—too well in some respects, since he was the principal prize-fighter of the 'good old times.' Yet, strange to say, old accounts of the badger as a general rule contain little more than a few commonplace remarks, stock anecdotes—singularly un-badgerlike—some stereotyped quotations from Buffon, together with comments upon the then prevailing 'sport' of badger-baiting. Compared with one another, most of these descriptions read almost word for word, and, although appearing under many different names, in no way suggest anything approaching original research or observation.

Now, in these enlightened times, can we with justice claim an appreciably wider knowledge than William Osbaldiston displayed when writing his quaint treatise on the *Noble Art of Venery*, as pursued towards the close of the eighteenth century, or the compiler of the *Sportsman's Cyclopedia*, published for the instruction of those who studied woodcraft fifty years later? Modern Nature writers for the most part can tell us little more than that the badger is a representative of the weasel family; that he is a burrowing and a hibernating animal; that he is fond of wasp-grubs, but, being unable to exist entirely upon this commodity, owing to the limited supply, he may be considered tolerably omnivorous in his diet. Even upon the latter point they appear to be uncertain, as evinced by the interminable discussions as to whether the creature is or is not addicted to raiding henroosts, committing murderous assaults upon sheepfolds during the lambing season, munching up game chicks, and all the many things not done by law-abiding citizens of the woods and brakes—if such exist. In a word, the badger, like most truly wild creatures, has been reluctant to divulge his

entire history. Circumstances have compelled him to reveal its bare outline, but, like the stolid Devonian who sold the original copy of *Widecombe Fair* to Mr. Baring Gould, but took care to 'keep some o' the best verses for hisself,' so the badger has contrived to reserve and keep intact many interesting secrets concerning the details of his inner life.

In Nature study perhaps the greatest difficulty lies in determining the precise point at which fact ends and fiction begins, or in tracing the origin of the many purely fictitious notions that somehow get afoot. Accident has probably been responsible for most of them, some anecdote exaggerated or improperly explained. Mistakes again so easily occur, while in these days pure invention is too frequently called upon to supply the lack of first-hand experience or observation. Mr. Herbert Ponting, in his book *The Great White South*, gives an illuminating account of the manner in which a sea-animal story, extorted from him by a Sydney reporter, was embellished beyond recognition, and I remember a naïve request made to me by a newspaper correspondent by whom I was accosted when stepping off a C.P. Transcontinental express. The man wished to know whether anything of outstanding interest had occurred upon the journey, and, receiving a reply in the negative, he demanded with characteristic western brevity whether I could not oblige him with some glaring untruth for the occasion, since he was out to procure unique copy for his paper by fair means or foul.

It is not difficult to believe that the 'professional naturalist,' pledged to provide an interesting daily or weekly article, must now and again find himself in a position similar to that of the reporters mentioned, and this thought inevitably crossed my mind when, not long ago, I was assailed in the hunting-field by an acquaintance who opened fire with a startling question: 'Is it true that a fox invariably emerges from its earth backwards?' My reply to the effect that a fox might do so when—and only when—someone was drawing it out by the brush did not appear to satisfy the interrogator. It transpired that he had just been reading an article containing that assertion, and, though it is quite possible that the writer had good reason for making such an announcement, one would like to know how the idea originated. There can be little doubt that many utterly erroneous, but frequently accepted, impressions are based upon foundations as unsubstantial. A circumstance incorrectly observed or accounted for, a statement repeated with a little exaggeration, a measure of credulity on the part of readers or listeners, and a theory springs into being which all the accumulated knowledge of the scientists is powerless to explode.

It is, indeed, nearly impossible to explode any notion, however

fantastic, concerning wild creatures. Even the ancient and, one may venture to say, absurd question as to whether the hedgehog does or does not suck cows has lately been revived, and its pros and cons debated in prominent journals. All the stock arguments, both for the prosecution and defence, have been brought into play, the inevitable 'authentic' instances given and discredited, the sceptic pointing out that the unfortunate little beast is physically incapable of doing anything of the kind. They argue about the sharpness of its spines and teeth, which any self-respecting cow might reasonably be expected to resent, or the insufficient size of its mouth for such a purpose, which latter, incidentally, is a somewhat weak contention, as anyone can testify who has seen the width of his gape when bisecting a large black slug. Curiously enough, however, one simple and conclusive argument does not appear to occur to the disputants. The hedgehog, after all is said and done, is an exceedingly small animal. He can drink at most a teacupful of milk, and, even admitting that the cow permitted the liberty, the amount consumed would be too insignificant to be missed. In the given instances of cows sucked dry the culprit for this reason must necessarily be a much larger animal—probably some other member of the herd.

Authenticated instances of the seemingly impossible are constantly cropping up in natural history, to confound the eminent scientist—who, as a rule, wisely assumes his armour of severe and impenetrable incredulity—and secretly to puzzle the less distinguished but equally accurate observer. There are people who appear to specialise in remarkable experiences, even as there are undeniably good card-holders, or people who possess a positively uncanny knack of 'drawing a winner.' These are, perhaps, the most difficult to 'catch out,' since as a rule they possess the knack of making a great deal out of nothing. Then we have the habitual yarn-spinner, who allows his imagination so free a range that in course of time he almost comes to believe his own stories and is unable to refrain from romancing even in the course of ordinary conversation. One is reminded of Longfellow's Iagoo, than whom

> None had made so many journeys,
> None had seen so many wonders,

and, though this type of person is seldom taken seriously in everyday life, he is apt to work considerable mischief if he happens to specialise in natural history.

Again, there is the sensationalist who finds the mid-winter bird's nest or hears the early cuckoo. He has an incurable trick of 'seeing things.' He is genuine enough—to the best of his

own habits—his faults being merely over-keenness and an excessive optimism which frequently cause him to mistake the commonplace for the unique. His case is a trifle difficult. If encouraged, his frequent discoveries become wearisome, while, on the other hand, polite incredulity is not always easily expressed. I once heard an old West Country farmer describing a recent alleged experience to a crony. It concerned a fox, which, if I remember correctly, had been chased round a thick covert by the farmer's terrier in a somewhat curious manner. He had just reached the most vivid point of the narrative, when the other broke in with the leading question as to who had actually seen the fox. The narrator claiming that distinction, his friend announced, with engaging but disconcerting candour: 'Then I don't believe a word o' it.'

So downright a manner of repudiating questionable statements is scarcely customary in polite conversation. However incredulous, one makes some non-committal remark, and the narrator passes on to repeat his story elsewhere. There are times, however, when the position becomes a trifle difficult. A year or two ago I was requested by a neighbour to come and view a marvellous 'viper,' 4 feet in length, which he had just despatched, being, of course, immensely proud of the achievement. Accompanied by a friend, I went, not without misgivings, to inspect the prodigy. It was suspended full length from a beam in an outhouse, while the man who had killed it—the hero of the hour—stood telling the tale of his prowess to an awe-stricken audience of village people who were studying the reptile from a respectful distance as, kept in motion by frequent tentative pokes from a stick, it pivoted slowly upon its string, its bruised olive-green skin still glossy in the sunlight. It was certainly a remarkable specimen of its kind, but, needless to say, not a viper, and I was at a loss what to say or do when my companion, who, though no naturalist, was at least capable of distinguishing the common objects of the hedgerows, blurted out: 'Surely it's a grass-snake.' Soften it as I might, the blow had fallen. Not too heavily, however, for it was a characteristic case of a man convinced against his will, and I have no doubt that he remade many converts after our departure.

The man concerned, it should be emphasised, was far from being a tyro. On the contrary, he had literally grown grey in the study of the wild creatures among whom he had lived and whose habits he had closely observed for half a century. One would have accepted a statement from him upon any question of woodcraft or natural history without reserve. The instance, however, proved him as capable of glaring error as the merest novice, and the case is only one of many that have occurred

within my experience, the mistake in every case being made in perfect good faith. *Humanum est errare;* and, in view of this unchallengeable aphorism, a measure of caution in accepting any statement is not so much advisable as imperatively necessary.

Purely fictitious tales more often than not defeat their own ends by their obvious absurdity, and one cannot but suspect that many of the old tales recorded by early writers must have originated in the imaginative brain of some wag whose sole idea at the moment was to 'get a rise' out of his listeners. Quite recently I came across a hedgehog story proceeding from no less distinguished a pen than that of the naturalist Jesse. One does not question his veracity, but in this instance one has misgivings as to the reliability of his informant. Here is the passage *verbatim:*

> During the summer of 1818, as Mr. Lane, gamekeeper to the Earl of Galloway, was passing by the wood of Glascaden, near Garlieston, in Scotland, he fell in with a hedgehog, crossing the road at a small distance before him, carrying on its back six pheasant's eggs, which upon examination he found it had pilfered from a pheasant's nest hard by. The ingenuity of the creature was very conspicuous, as several of the remaining eggs were holed, which must have been done by it when in the act of rolling itself over the nest, in order to make as many adhere to its prickles as possible. After watching the motions of the urchin for a short time longer, Mr. Lane saw it deliberately crawl into a furze-bush, where its nest was, and where the shells of several eggs were strewn around, which had at some former period been conveyed thither in the same manner.

An interesting anecdote, but from a practicable point of view utterly impossible, as anyone who has tried to penetrate the shell of a pheasant's egg with a pin cannot fail to be aware. To pierce the shell of any large egg a considerable amount of concentrated and judiciously applied pressure is necessary. This, in the hedgehog's case, would be out of the question. Even if he deliberately rolled upon the clutch, the points of his slender spines would be deflected by the hard polished surface of the eggs. To crush them by dint of his weight would be the utmost that he could achieve, and even supposing that he impaled one or two, these would certainly be dislodged in his awkward struggles to regain his feet. The proceeding, however, is inconsistent with the animal's habits, since the hedgehog makes no store nor does it carry food to its nest. It feeds as it goes, and I have never seen a tame hedgehog carry away as much as a crumb. Again the mental process by means of which the creature might be induced to employ its spines for so unnatural a use undoubtedly exceeds the plainly defined limitations of the animal mind, which preclude the possibility of any creature deliberately turning parts of its body to other account than their own natural function.

The prickly armour of a hedgehog serves its owner for defensive purposes only, and not for attack, or—the same thing in effect—as a means of procuring and conveying supplies. Its jaws would be employed for any such use. One would be exceedingly surprised to see a dog carrying a package under its armpit instead of in its mouth, which constitutes, I think, a parallel case. The egg story is on a par with the old notion of a rat sampling the contents of a bottle by the introduction of its long tail—an impracticable proceeding for many obvious reasons—or that of a squirrel deliberately setting forth for a cruise upon a piece of bark with tail erected to serve as a sail, though the latter idea rests upon the authority of the solemn Olaus Magnus, whose integrity was beyond question. The most extravagant tales are all vouched for by somebody, and therein lies the difficulty. The hedgehog anecdote, if indeed witnessed, could have been nothing else than the result of some practical joke. That appears to be the one hope for the veracity of the worthy gamekeeper.

Almost equally unacceptable is the belief still current among many naturalists that the badger, suspecting the presence of traps, deliberately *rolls* upon them to avoid being caught. In this case, however, there is a substratum of truth to account for the supposition. The badger, like the ratel and others of his family, is exceedingly fond of rolling. It is more than likely that one of his first acts upon emerging from his burrow is to indulge in this special form of recreation, and beyond question he has been known actually to roll over traps placed in his runways, escaping upon such occasions with no worse consequences to himself than a nasty pinch and a considerable fright. In these cases, however, his good fortune has been due to accident rather than conscious forethought upon his part. Had he entertained the slightest suspicion of the trap's presence, one cannot believe that the shy creature would deliberately tamper with so deadly a contrivance, nor is it quite reasonable to suppose him capable of sufficient acumen to realise that the cruel iron teeth, whose hold upon one of his limbs would prove so inexorable, could obtain no effective grip upon the broad surface of his back. Actually few animals are more wary of a gin, and few are more skilful at locating its whereabouts. Not long ago I asked a local trapper, who was pursuing his dreadful vocation dangerously near the haunts of a badger which I was anxious to preserve, to spare the animal if it had the misfortune to be caught. He replied that I might set my mind at rest upon that score, his chance of catching it being slight indeed. He told me that in the course of thirty years' experience he had never found a badger in one of his rabbit-gins, though foxes and almost all other animals frequently took the fatal step. Badgers, of course, *are* caught in gins, but

only upon comparatively rare occasions and by the exercise of considerable trouble and ingenuity.

Both the badger and hedgehog are decidedly interesting creatures. Truth is usually more wonderful than fiction, and each of these animals in the course of its ordinary life displays abilities more remarkable than any of the habits erroneously ascribed to it. The badger in particular appears to possess senses entirely unknown to science. I have often remarked upon his amazing dexterity in locating the precise whereabouts of young rabbits ensconced in their nesting burrows 2 or 3 feet below the surface of the ground. Every sportsman knows the difficulty of fixing the spot under which some stubborn old rabbit is occupying a ferret's attention, and as often as not a good dog is powerless to render any effectual assistance, even with subterranean rumblings and bumpings to indicate the place. The badger, however, with no other guide than his own extraordinary nose, experiences no such difficulty. One sniff at the burrow's mouth assures him that it is occupied. He proceeds to find the nearest point from which the nursery can be approached—it may be yards away from the hole—and, if not too deep, he bores his way straight into it, horizontally or vertically as the case may be. He always appears to know the precise extent of his own ability. A dog when tunnelling is frequently baulked by roots or boulders, and is obliged to abandon the attempt, but I have never yet inspected a shaft sunk by a badger which did not bear tragic testimony to the success of the venture. A dog, it should be remarked, can wind rabbits from the burrow's mouth quite as readily as a badger, but he lacks the sense that enables the wild animal to locate their exact whereabouts. He can only adopt the comparatively clumsy and seldom effective method of following the passage, nor can he wind a rabbit immediately beneath him unless very near the surface. The badger, indeed, appears to be gifted with faculties which one can only classify as 'underground senses,' and, unlike any other animal, he seems able to exist almost entirely without air. When terriers invade his stronghold his favourite device is to 'bury himself' by dint of boring yet deeper into the sand and blocking the passage behind him. This in the case of almost any other animal would amount to an act of suicide. When men inexperienced at the work attempt to dig out a fox, more often than not they only succeed in blocking the hole and losing it altogether. The fox in such a case never comes out, unless there happens to be another passage communicating with that in which he is entombed. Neither, incidentally, does a rabbit. A comparatively short space of time suffices to suffocate either of these animals when confined to a limited area underground. A badger, however, has other re-

[illegible] at his disposal. I have never yet heard of an instance of his death from suffocation, or, for that matter, of such an accident in the case of a ferret, though the latter is not infrequently confined for a long while in the narrowest compass by the body of a rabbit that it has killed, and which effectually blocks the narrow passage. This, one might remark, is almost the only point upon which the badger displays any qualities in common with the other weasels. Apart from any structural connecting links, it is difficult to trace any resemblance in habit or deportment between the badger and his supposed relatives, the true weasels. He entirely lacks, for example, their astonishing agility, being, for his size, the slowest animal upon four legs. I once knew a man, neither young nor particularly active, who prided himself upon his ability to outpace any badger, and upon the occasion of a moonlight hunt he undertook for a trifling bet to pursue and touch with his foot the first badger that took to the open. This he actually accomplished, chasing an old 'boar' across a large pasture and applying his boot to the animal's hindquarters just as it reached the fence. By so doing he 'killed the scent'—to employ the conventional term for one of the most unaccountable things that can happen in hunting—and, spoiling the sport in consequence, made himself generally unpopular.

Another habit of the badger, shared with few others of the weasel family, is that of hibernating, which goes farther than anything to disprove the fiercely carnivorous tendencies of which he is accused by people who seek an excuse for persecuting him. No strictly carnivorous animal hibernates, with the exception of the polar bear, who has acquired this habit for obvious reasons. It is lack of their customary food that compels animals to seek winter quarters. When, therefore, the roots, berries, and small reptile and insect life upon which the badger mainly subsists are no longer procurable, he adopts the wisest course possible, and goes to sleep until better times, leaving his rapacious cousins the polecat, the marten, and the ermine to carry on their sanguinary business as usual. In this respect, again, the hedgehog, another insectivorous creature, follows the badger's example. In most of his ways, indeed, the prickly 'urchin' is a badger in miniature. Like the grey prowler, he commits few real depredations, though either animal is not averse from availing itself of any windfall in the shape of a young bird or an egg that chance throws in its way. A hedgehog may enter a coop at times, just as a badger now and again forces its way into a henroost. Such instances are so unusual, however, that they are not worthy of consideration, and one cannot but wonder that people take so much trouble to 'establish' them. When established they can only be regarded as the exceptions to which every rule is subject.

A hedgehog cannot burrow for himself; [illegible] fossorial limbs, even as the badger lacks the prickly [illegible], though provided with a wiry coat of no common texture. He loses little on account of this weakness, however, since he makes himself at home in anyone's burrow, and into some dry hole he retreats at winter's approach, there to make that astonishing little nest—one might almost call it a cocoon—which few people have an opportunity of seeing. A hedgehog, deep in his winter sleep, is literally encased in a thick wadding of dry grass, moss, straw, any material that may be obtainable; and how the little beast succeeds in wrapping himself up so closely and how he extricates himself are questions that may well puzzle an observer, or anyone unacquainted with the endless patience of the wild folk.

A hedgehog cannot be described as fair game to anyone. He is too defenceless, too inoffensive, and it speaks well for his timid methods of self-preservation that he exists in England to-day. The badger, up to a certain point, is very well able to take care of himself. In a country of deep sandbanks he has always an unassailable stronghold at hand, within which he can defy direct assault. Upon clay lands, on the contrary, where no creature can burrow deeply, he is helpless, and would soon be exterminated were he not more or less preserved for so-called 'badger-hunting'—a pastime to be discouraged by all genuine sportsmen, since the capture of the hapless creature is too frequently followed by baiting in some barn or enclosure. The legitimate sport that the badger provides is little. He is seldom hunted with hounds, since that involves nightwork, and he can only be shot after patient waiting, either between his 'settes' and the nearest water upon long midsummer afternoons or when emerging from his burrow some moonlight night, when, for once, the friendly wind has failed to warn him of danger. Almost every sportsman naturalist, when passing through the thoughtless stage, has matched his wits against those of the badger at some time or other, and endeavoured to circumvent him when following his own secluded way under the summer stars. After a while, however, studying him year by year, learning more about his many curious and interesting ways, the hunter's attitude gradually changes. One's sympathies go out to the independent, stout-hearted beast who, molesting nobody, asks only to be let alone. Far from scheming his overthrow, one loses all desire to turn the shy creature's happiness into tragedy, and offers him, as a rule, that measure of protection which lies within one's power. The badger sorely needs active protection, at least from unmerited and illegitimate persecution. The R.S.P.C.A. would do well to concentrate upon his case.

DOUGLAS GORDON.

CONRAD AND THE YOUNGER GENERATION

contemporary literary reputation is static, and the first few ears after a writer's death nearly always bring about changes critical opinion, which, while seldom lasting, are nevertheless dicative of a new spirit. While a man is alive criticism, which is rgely a polite gesture as far as the famous are concerned, is apt be blurred by over-emphasis, but when he is gone we see him om another angle, an angle that either fortifies our belief or akes us wonder at our former enthusiasm. When death puts end to life, it puts also an end to an era. With the passing of e personality the man himself ceases to stand between us and s creations. The work is finished: the time has arrived to judge with what we believe to be perspective. When the pæans praise have faded, the reaction sets in. The voice of genius mehow loses its convincing quality when it echoes from a fresh ave; and therefore, while it is interesting to watch the changing ientation of criticism, it is foolish to let it sway our own indepenent jugment.

On the other hand, outside literary circles death often has the ect of making people perceive what they have lost: a literary putation is frequently both rising and falling at the same time. hile the critic is no longer under the sway of a personality, the erage man is moved by the disappearance of a great figure. nd so what I propose to do in this article is to examine, as well I can, the hold that the work of Joseph Conrad (who has now en dead for over five years) has both upon the younger generaon of writers and upon the younger generation of people as a hole.

It must be remembered that the idol of one generation of tics is invariably suspect of the next. As soon as a reputation established and has escaped from the boundaries of a clique, it sure to be questioned. This is in the natural order of things, those who have left our tutelage cease to be our special possesn; and we ought not to be in the least surprised to find that the of Joseph Conrad is now undergoing that ordeal both in nerica and in England.

The young writers of to-day are not contemptuous of him as

they are, say, of Meredith, but some of them consider that he has been over-praised and that his work does not adequately stand the tests they deem imperative. To this school Conrad is a romanticist; and as its whole tendency is away from romance—to which, of course, it applies its own meaning—it regards him as an exotic 'sport' rather than as a serious novelist.

Such critics do not deny power to Conrad; they only deny supreme importance. They respect his gifts, but they consider that they were partially wasted. Conrad so often stands for what they dislike; he is, for them, too involved in his approach, too sumptuous in his language, and, at the same time, too conventional in his attitude. To be daring in conception while simple in expression is, one might say, the aim of the present school. This may seem an over-statement, but I think that an examination of the more creative current literature will show that, if the ideas tend to be bizarre, the construction tends to be conservative. There are exceptions, I am aware, but I am dealing with the main stream. I do not go so far as to assert that the writers of to-day follow the example of Lenin, who put shattering ideas into language that a child could follow, but I do maintain that subtly individualised and modulated directness is now the admired goal.

It is dangerous to generalise, but it appears to me that in England a cool clarity, rather reminiscent of the eighteenth century, is sought for, while in the United States the effort is to write a 'hard-boiled' prose which goes straight to the point without any frills. English and American literature travel more and more along different lines, but the young novelists of both countries are affected, according to their national bias, by a new conception of realism. Perhaps this is a reaction from the symbolism which has been so rampant, but in any case it is realism which fights shy of sentiment and which sees in the beauty that at once captures the heart and stirs the imagination something to be avoided.

This realism has its own artificial rules, but every school of criticism regards its opinions as absolute and judges other writers accordingly. To the modern intellectuals Conrad's atmospheric effects and emotional stress are alike rather distasteful. They read into these things a lack of that classic calm or matter-of-fact downrightness through which alone, according to them, the world can be viewed without exaggeration and with aloof hyperbole.

They would even deny that he was a first-rate psychologist. They would argue that he walks round his characters instead of studying them at first hand, and would assert probably that the characters themselves are romantic figments. The glow of Conrad's creative energy is lost upon these analytical materialists.

[illegible] and the very richness of his gifts disturbs them. His subtlety and compassion, which, as expressed by him, are in their eyes only too likely to distort the face of truth, seem unsound and alarming.

And, as I said before, they do not like what one may call his philosophy. His conservatism appears to them stultifying to the free spirit of an artist. I daresay this is much less true of America than of England, where radical opinions are considered as the birthright of literary originality, but I fancy that in both countries Conrad's ideas on social and political problems are antipathetic to the modern spirit—the modern spirit as represented by this particular school. The writer of to-day wants to rid himself of all inhibitions; he feels that it is only by so doing that he can examine every question anew. The novel for him is, in the main, a work of exploration, a revaluing of all the activities and codes of life.

It is, of course, extremely easy to exaggerate these tendencies and to announce a general rule from particular cases, but it is universally true that hero-worship is repulsive to the anti-romantic and that nothing pleases him more than to criticise with careful lack of enthusiasm any outstanding figure.

Destructive criticism, expressed in language of contemptuous finality, is the natural weapon of people resolved to liberate their imaginations from the stifling weight of their predecessors. The creative writer must fortify himself by a belief in his own attitude, and destructive criticism is one of the simplest ways to achieve that. Such an attitude is instinctive, not forced, and it is a profound mistake to argue that egotism, rather than conviction, is at the back of it. New work requires new standards, and new standards automatically require that the old standards be disparaged.

Moreover, look at it from another point of view. We are inclined to smile at the apparently self-satisfied coteries formed by minorities, but we forget that self-satisfaction is a challenge and that inner diffidence often goes with outer dogmatism. People in a minority tend to gravitate together, for, apart from their common interests, they know that the best means of defying, and ultimately persuading, the world is to show a bold and united front. Individual certitude is all very well, but as soon as we can find a few people to agree with us our very certitude is vastly strengthened. It was, I think, Novalis who made a remark to this effect, and it explains much.

And we must be careful to differentiate between the genuine writers and the hangers-on. There is no snobbery more hopeless than that of the second-rate persons who want to be in the swim. Such persons abound upon the outskirts of the latest artistic movements and delight in giving them their enthusiastic and

spurious support. One can find plenty of [illegible] to attack great writers with parrot phrases; but the [illegible] critic does not attack Conrad because he despises him, but because he thinks that, though he is on the wrong tack, he is formidable. Conrad himself would at times speak with positive violence about his special *bête noir*, Dostoievsky, but he did so just because he knew that many intelligent people were under his influence—which he regarded as detestable.

It is stupid to dismiss adverse criticism with a mere shrug of annoyance until one has tried to discover what it is that has induced it. And this can sometimes best be achieved by an oblique method. Let us see, for example, what the modern young critics' reactions are to another great writer recently dead. I refer to Thomas Hardy. Why is it that Hardy is, on the whole, more to their liking than Conrad? His construction is often crude, his style often wooden, and at times he sinks into an appalling banality. And yet just because he endeavours to be realistic and direct, and because he often takes what looks like a Nihilistic view of existence, his glaring faults are pardoned and his old-fashioned methods condoned. They perceive *his* real greatness, while Conrad's real greatness seems to elude them.

Hardy, it is true, had a romanticism of his own, but to the modern mind it is not a dangerous romanticism like Conrad's. It is, in essence, a Victorian romanticism; and that strikes them as being quaint rather than disquieting. It is as though a man whose intellect one respected had some odd kink about the earth being flat. It is no use trying to pin down a critic, but I am of the opinion that if certain critics of to-day are trying to undermine the foundation upon which Conrad's fame rests, it is largely because they feel that in the writings of this remarkable but, to them, mistaken man there is a seductive charm and passionate intensity which correspond to some false need of the age.

This is an era of complaisant verdicts. But now, as always, criticism is a matter of personal predilections; and personal predilections are conditioned by surroundings. Why, then, feel agitated by these changes of opinion, which, like a thief in the night, always seem to arrive when we are least expecting them?

Time alone enables us to approximate to absolute judgments, and although every critic can give voluminous reasons for his views, it is certain that many of the deepest of these reasons are imponderable and unself-conscious. There are fashions in all things, and just as the fashions in clothes of ten years ago often look more incongruous than those of a hundred years ago, so do the artistic ideals of yesterday often appear peculiarly obsolete to the latest school. This accounts, no doubt, for the fact that, while writers of the recent past are constantly being consigned

[illegible] brought out of it. The universal dislike of growing old is youth's most powerful weapon, and the young always have the whip-hand. To be called middle-aged and incapable of receiving new impressions is as deadly a charge as to be told that you are lacking in a sense of humour. Few have the moral daring to argue that maturity has as just a vision as youth.

And there is still another reason why Conrad's hold upon the critics is scarcely what it was. Conrad was a unique product of three nations—Poland where he was born, France where he spent the receptive years of his young manhood, England where he worked and became celebrated—and his gifts were both too strange and too original for him to found a new school or to be accepted fully as a representative author. To begin with, naturally, these very qualities, so striking in their freshness, attracted fervent praise. But it was almost inevitable that sooner or later they would awaken opposition. Conrad's work is not in the true line of succession of English literature ; and though the moderns may despise their predecessors, yet they cannot help possessing the same national traits.

When I was a boy Meredith was still, more or less, the hero of the young men. I have seen his place taken—also, more or less—by Stendal, Dostoievsky, James, Conrad, Proust, and goodness knows who else. I have seen one group of writers rise and another fall ; the rehabilitation of the eighteenth century ; the emergence into popularity, with one set, of Trollope and Melville, the eclipse, with another, of Turgenief and Anatole France. One can see almost anything if one waits long enough. As Conrad wrote in one of his books, ' All passes and all changes.' The wheel of fashion frequently makes the full circle, and long oblivion sometimes blossoms again into fame. I do not know who is now the guiding light. Perhaps nobody is. Perhaps the age is sufficient to itself and every man is his own mentor. It would be at any rate, a sign of vitality, assurance and courage.

But finally let me revert to what I wrote at the beginning of this paper about the inevitable reaction which follows upon death. When all is said and done, it is there that one may perhaps discover the most potent reason for the present attitude of certain critics. It is indeed a universal experience that within a few years of death a lauded reputation, a high fame, always suffer a temporary eclipse. Every observer has seen that happen again and again. In the light of time it is really of little importance—it all depends on the man—for it is but analogous to the swing of a pendulum.

And let us remember that while the critics may blame Conrad for certain defects, it does not necessarily follow that he had

these defects, or that, if he did have them, they are easily [illegible] I do not propose to argue the point; I only want to call attention to it. In my opinion Conrad's adverse critics could be, as a rule, successfully answered out of Conrad's own books; but that is a business I can leave to others. I would observe, however, that in Conrad's letters there are refutations of some of the very things with which he is charged. For example, the younger critics do not like his eloquence; but Conrad's eloquence was not due to a love of fine writing, but was bound up with his whole method and personality. As he wrote to me once, 'I have always tried to avoid eloquence, a thing contemptible in itself.'

I have been speaking hitherto about the opinions of one modern group—certain advanced critics of the younger generation—and even so I have epitomised their scattered views as though each held all those which I have enumerated. But I have done this, and emphasised the different points, because, according to precedent, the time may quite likely arrive when these critics will begin to influence a bigger circle of readers and when people will allow their own judgment to be stampeded against their will. Earthquakes are often heralded by subterranean rumbles.

When Conrad died his fame was spreading fast over the entire English-speaking universe. He was admired alike by the complex and by the simple, by the able critic and by the average man, by every type of reader from the scholar to the schoolboy. It was fame of that order which is granted only to those in whose work people feel there is something inherently great: and now, even despite the partial defection of the present-day critics, that fame is still growing. And it may be illuminating to trace this growth and so try to get an insight into its real force.

The general interest in Conrad began, I surmise, as a fashionable craze. After the publication of *Chance* in 1914 it became the correct thing to read Conrad. That kind of vogue, usually so fleeting, is liable to overtake any author. Sometimes, as may be witnessed about once a year, it is due to the striking of an unexpected chord which happens to catch the restless attention of a public always eager for a new sensation; sometimes, as in Conrad's case, it is due to the steady, cumulative effect of discerning criticism spread over a decade or longer. *Chance*—which, incidentally, was not among Conrad's own favourites—was no more remarkable than many of his previous books, but it caught the ear of the public because that ear had been at last attuned to welcome the note.

But what began as a fashion has gradually developed into a reality. The average reader of Conrad to-day is a real lover of his works. And he is more than that: he has a critical instinct

[illegible] about them which corresponds surprisingly to Conrad's own ideas. For instance, I am always meeting people who assure me that *Nostromo* is the book, above all others, that appeals to them. Well, Conrad himself regarded *Nostromo* as his principal creative effort, but it must be admitted that in the old days he got little support for that view even from those very critics whose literary flair made his reputation and led to his triumph.

Conrad, in short, has come into his own with a class of readers who, without being literary in the accepted sense, have nevertheless instinctive critical perceptions. I do not mean that such readers perceive everything that a critic might perceive; but I am not at all sure that they do not often perceive things which the critic, with his preconceived notions, misses. All contemporary criticism, as history shows, is apt to ignore one of the most valuable things in a writer—that something which echoes within the inner consciousness after the book has been laid aside. For criticism is often more taken up with technicalities and comparisons than with that finer essence which interpenetrates art and gives it its ultimate appeal. And it must be said that over and over again it has been that despised thing, public opinion, that has really discovered an author. Written criticism is never the last word, and that is particularly true in the case of Conrad. At the present moment his influence, like an irresistible tide, is flowing out beyond the bounds of fastidious analysis to sink deep into the minds of this generation. Whatever may happen to Conrad's fame in the future, it will never contract into a rarefied cult: his appeal is too many-sided.

The dead Conrad is a living force to an increasing multitude. To them he stands for something which transcends literature and yet is bound up with literature. He has created for them a world within a world, and to many young people he is the one writer who really 'counts.' Conrad himself had no belief in the endurance of fame and did not write with an eye on posterity; to do that would have been odious to him in its assumption of Olympian superiority. But all the same, the kind of recognition accorded him after his death would have pleased him. For that recognition is primarily due to the absolute integrity of his art.

The myriads who draw sustenance from Conrad's writings feel a sort of personal fellowship with him, which they could never feel towards a man, however brilliant, who was lacking in a wide humanity. Conrad creates, of course, a universe of gorgeous variety and adventure for those who live circumscribed lives; but an imaged universe can be found in numerous other writers, and is not in itself his main appeal. There is something in the combined sobriety of his outlook and splendour of his imagination which make many feel akin to him in spirit. And in his philosophy

of mingled irony and pity, in his hatred of shams, in his respect for duty, he stands forth as a man like to others but built on a larger mould. The reading public is relatively voiceless, but its discernment is, on occasion, far keener than the professional critic is prepared to recognise. Some of the most astute judgments passed on Conrad have been passed by people who never write a word for publication and who would not dream of setting themselves up as critics.

Many readers are, of course, not analytical: that is to say, the processes of their thought do not emerge into conscious explanations of why they like or dislike. But the silent opinions of such are suggestive, and I have watched with a good deal of care the reactions of this type of reader to the novels of Conrad. To one he will be quite incomprehensible, to another he will be the very voice he has longed for: Conrad is not a writer who excites lukewarm emotions even in those who pick up a book merely to pass the time. For his work is not only extraordinarily impressive in itself, but is concerned with fundamentals which cannot escape attention. If Conrad was simply a romanticist he would be read and thrown aside; if he was simply a literary artist he would be disregarded; but it is because he creates in the grand manner out of the fulness of his humanity and genius that he arrests the attention of so many average people—even of people who are usually contemptuous of novels. It is very curious. He has touched some chord in the modern outlook which, bound up as it is with the reactions of personality, cannot be completely described.

That is a thing to bear in mind. The appeal of Conrad, like the appeal of all the really great writers, is at once obvious and mysterious. After we have said everything we can, something still remains unsaid. I am not pretending that he is universally admired by his readers; I am only saying that the number of those who do admire him is augmenting. To many, of course, he is just a fascinating enigma, and to many but a standard author of whom one ought to possess a set; but to an increasing number he appears, odd as the term must seem, like a long-lost brother who has been found. To such people there is something strangely intimate about his work: it is as if they recognised in it a whisper of their own aspirations. Now this is very striking when we consider that, though Conrad was simple in some ways, he was exceedingly complex in others. But perhaps the explanation is that, while his genius was complex, his attitude was basically simple. Many of those who never actually met him have, as one might put it, found him in the texture of his books.

I shall probably be told—it would not be for the first time—that Conrad is a man's writer rather than a woman's, and that

therefore any argument is vitiated from the start. But is it? Conrad certainly inhabits a world of action in which men play a preponderant part, but though he has more men admirers than women, yet he does appeal very much to many women. That is a fact. Women, being themselves decided realists, are inclined to think that he idealised his feminine characters; but women, like men, do not only admire the novelist in Conrad: they, too, are subject to his deeper influence. Conrad may, as is often said, have judged women from a man's point of view, but I want to know from what other point of view he could have judged them. Women are not attracted to a man with a feminine outlook, and there is a virility about Conrad's work which draws them despite his not always congenial treatment. One cannot make a generalisation to cover innumerable different views, but my impression is that Conrad, although not so much read by women as by men, is appreciatively read by more and more of them. Conrad himself highly valued the opinion of women. I remember his writing to me: 'You know how I prize women's appreciation, which, for a man not specialising in sentiment, is about the greatest reward one's sincerity can obtain.'

And, indeed, it is that sincerity of his which attracts women to him as it attracts men. Of course, it is not only his sincerity—as Conrad said to me once, when we were discussing the sincerity of a fanatic, 'The value of sincerity depends on what you are sincere about'—but without it he might have spoken with the tongue of men and of angels and been entirely ineffective.

I am not here concerned to discuss Conrad as an artist and as a creator; I am only concerned to put forward the two views about him that are so much in the air to-day. But it is surely permissible to admire some of the extremely able work now being produced by writers of the younger generation, as also indeed the critical profundity and originality of much that they have to say, without being swept off one's feet. It would be as absurd to deny that Conrad's work has limitations as it would be to deny that his very mannerisms and outlook are as antagonistic to some as they are attractive to others; but it seems to me that there is a greatness about him that outweighs everything else. And it is that which finally matters.

And furthermore, he was in some ways very fortunate. The experiences of his middle years gave him the very material which his special gifts required: it is doubtful whether they could have ever flowered as they did unless excited by the gorgeous background of his life. Then, again, he did not publish his first book until he was a man approaching forty and he died before old age had withered his powers. Thus there is a blessed lack of immature or feeble work to regret, and thus there is a sense of splendid

homogeneity and completeness about his achievement. Naturally his work is of varied importance, and naturally it underwent changes in method, but his attitude always remained the same, and everything that he wrote has a real, and not merely an historical, value.

At its best his style is one of marvellous flexibility and richness, and although we may call his characters romantic, we may equally call them realistic. And remember that nearly all of Conrad's plots are founded upon fact and are no more far-fetched than life itself. The criticism of him that nibbles here and there seems to me to miss the point. For it is not in a nicety of perfection that Conrad stands out; it is in the rounded harmony of the total result. Conrad himself disliked the idea of choosing selected passages from his work to form an anthology, and he would equally have disliked a criticism of his books that did not see that each must be judged as a whole.

Let me make myself quite clear: Conrad willingly recognised his own shortcomings, but he had much of common sense, and he would not have been at all impressed by criticism, either favourable or unfavourable, which did not perceive what he was aiming at. As a matter of fact, Conrad, within certain broad limits, was very tolerant of the opinions of others; he would have felt little surprise or annoyance at the criticisms now levelled against him. He did not put himself on a pinnacle; he merely went his way. As can be judged from his published letters, his appreciation of the work of his younger contemporaries was sympathetic, although I admit that, when he wrote to friends about their own books, he sometimes allowed his affection to outweigh his judgment.

Indeed, one had to be pretty well acquainted with Conrad to know just what value to give to many of the things he said. Friendship might bias him in one direction, fits of irritability (caused by gout) in another. And he was too wise to say all that he thought on any one subject at any one time. On the surface he had many facets, and one had to acquire a kind of intuition to brush aside the apparent contradictions and to gain a just, if necessarily only a partial, idea of the real man. And, in a manner, those who only know him through his books have less to contend with in gauging the true Conrad than had those who knew him personally. His surface moods were perplexing, but the Conrad who wrote was not a man of the surface. His unmistakable deep personality is there in his books, and thousands of readers all over the world have, through a study of them, grasped the essential Conrad—the Conrad mirrored so faithfully in his written words.

R. CURLE.

BIOGRAPHY AND UNBELIEF

There has of recent years been a tremendous change in people's ideas upon the function of biography, and this change can be defined very briefly. To the Victorians, biography was the means of getting to know why certain men are great, or what makes others interesting. But to us to-day, all men are interesting and none, broadly speaking, great. The Victorians, in fact, were content with adoration; we demand analysis.

This point has been made often enough already. André Maurois has an illuminating chapter upon it in his recent *Aspects of Biography*. In the history of the human race, he says, there have been certain rare periods in which vast revolutions have been effected in a very short time. In England, as elsewhere, the human race, about the beginning of the twentieth century, passed through one of these periods of intellectual revolution. Of the nature of this revolution Maurois says little, beyond giving as one of its characteristics 'the invasion of the sphere of psychology and ethics by the intellectual methods of the man of learning.'

There is, of course, more in it than that. Psychology affects the modern mind; it gives man a weapon to work with, and a very keen weapon, but that is all. Whatever Freud, Jung, and Adler may say, souls are neither won by psychology nor lost by it. Psychology is a method, not an influence. Of influences to-day, as in all times past, there is only one that affects mankind as a whole, and that is what may be called the religious influence, or better, perhaps, the faith by which the person tries to establish to his own satisfaction his relationship to the universe.

The present age is often described as irreligious. It is also described, like all other ages there have ever been, as immoral. Its lack of religion has been given as the cause of its lack of morals. Nothing could be further from the truth. Without going so far as to insult religious people by suggesting that they are less moral than non-religious people, one must admit that a large proportion of the population is definitely non-religious as opposed to irreligious, and that the non-religious are quite as good citizens as those who enthusiastically profess some definite

creed. Whatever one's own personal views on the subject may be, it is a fact that in England now among what may be called the intellectual classes the non-religious are in the majority, and this suggests that the prevailing opinion in this country is non-religious. It might not be so. Minorities can exercise enormous power. But in this case one has only to look to the leading personalities of the literary world. Shaw, Wells, and Bennett—they are without question the most influential writers of our time. Do their writings give evidence of faith in any established creeds? Far from it. Shaw and Wells certainly are influenced in all they write by a passionate moral sense, but so far as belief is concerned this is destructive, not constructive; it impels the reader to jettison any previous convictions he may have had and start life afresh with a free and open mind. Wells, in moments of excitement, erects altars to the Unknown God. Bennett gets all the excitement he wants out of life itself, its triumphs, its vanities and all its commonplace detail. Then there is Galsworthy, who gives us in his novel *Beyond* this exquisite example of a contemporary mind in action:

'What do you think happens after death, Gyp?'

'Nothing, Dad. I think we just go back.'

'Ah—My idea, too!'

Neither of them had ever known what the other thought about it before!

Gyp murmured:

'La vie est vaine—
Un peu d'amour,
Un peu de haine,
Et puis bonjour!'

Not quite a laugh issued from Winton's lips.

'And what they call "God,"' he said, 'after all, what is it? Just the very best you can get out of yourself—so far as I can see. You can't imagine anything more than you can imagine. But there's one thing always puzzled me, Gyp. All my life I've had a single heart. Death comes, and out I go! Then why did I love, if there's to be no meeting after?'

'Perhaps loving somebody or something with all your heart is all in itself.'

Winton stared. 'Ye-es,' he said at last. 'The religious Johnnies are saving their money to put on a horse that'll never run after all. Those Yogi chaps in India—there they used to sit, the world might rot for all they cared—they were going to be all right themselves, in Kingdom come. But suppose it doesn't come?'

Slipping her hand through his arm, she pressed close up to him. 'Dad; you and I will go off into the wind and the sun, and the trees and the waters, like Procris in my picture.'

Such belief, or, if you prefer it, absence of belief, is typical

of all the people of our time who are in the habit of trying to think out things for themselves. 'One just goes out.' And what is the effect on our literature of this denial of the immortality of the soul?

It is impossible for man to dismiss entirely from his mind the question of life after death. It is too tremendous a subject. It is also hardly possible for a man not to want to survive. He may, however, come to believe the arguments of scientists who profess that the idea of personal survival is nothing more than a vain and idle hope. What then? He does not immediately lose all his hope. He no longer thinks of his soul as 'passing on,' but he can still think of it as enduring after him—here. The future life having, so he imagines, been proved non-existent, he demands of his destiny a continuance on this earth of his works or of his mere name after death has rid him of consciousness. This mental process, which is a natural if rather pathetic one, can be observed even behind the writings of Samuel Butler, who was one of the first of modern writers to insist that there is no such thing as permanent survival after death. Butler is content that when his time comes he should die. He does not fear death; he does not abhor the inevitability of absolute personal extinction. He takes it for granted. And yet there wells up occasionally in his notes the instinctive desire for survival that we all possess. 'On death,' he writes, 'we do not lose life, we only lose individuality; we live henceforth in others, not in ourselves.'[1] We live, that is, by being in the thoughts of others. Butler, therefore, sought to insure immortal life for himself in what was then an original manner. He deposited a copy of his unpublished writings with Henry Festing Jones, 'as a precaution against fire.'

Precautions of this kind are now more common. People to-day try to guard against entire extinction by leaving behind them all possible evidence of their existence. They write diaries and memoirs and autobiographies. Having demolished heaven, they set about building up reputations for themselves on this earth. Now Sir Thomas Browne long ago demonstrated the futility of this kind of memorial.

> The iniquity of oblivion blindly scattereth her poppy, and deals with the memory of men without distinction to merit of perpetuity. . . . In vain we compute our felicities by the advantage of our good names, since bad have equal durations, and Thersites is like to live as long as Agamemnon.[2]

This is a point that no thinking man can possibly ignore. Good and bad reputations have an equal chance of survival, and

[1] *The Notebooks.*
[2] *Hydriotaphia.*

one might presume, therefore, that people would think it fatuous to worry themselves about the chances of their names enduring after their death. But that is not how the modern mind works. A bad reputation is avoided for obvious reasons; and as for a good reputation, the term has no special meaning now, unless it be that a reputation is good if it offers a man prospects of immortality without jeopardising his chances of having a good time while he is still alive. Such a reputation comes to a man when he attains what the world calls success.

For the main point about success, whether it be artistic, political, or commercial, is this: it sets a man up in a conspicuous position. People cannot help noticing him. They cannot help talking about him. He is a classic, they say, a statesman, a genius. Already he has earned immortality. Before he is dead he is enshrined in a thousand newspaper interviews and appreciations, and people avidly read these to find out what the great man did which they have not got it in their power to do and why he is a famous man who will live, so they tell him, for ever, while they are insignificant and destined to die and be forgotten.

Thus has been born the present appetite for biographies, an appetite which has in it much of the zest of curiosity. We admire success. We venerate the people who have had the luck (as they often so irritatingly put it) to achieve success. We want to know how it is done. There are plenty of people ready to explain, and they know what is demanded of them. They take pains to remember that the attitude of the reader of biography to-day is very different from that of the ordinary religious man of even fifty years ago.

And if the present attitude is composed largely of curiosity, it has in it also an element of envy. We do definitely envy great reputations. We do more. We put them, so we think, to a more rigorous test than previous ages have ever employed. Previous ages were disposed to have their heroes gigantic and remote. We want to meet ours face to face and assure ourselves that they are of no more than our own stature. Since Lytton Strachey wrote *Eminent Victorians* there has been a host of intimate studies of great men and women. The subjects may remain great after the studies are completed, but they will cease to be the heroes they were. They have become human—men and women curiously little and curiously like ourselves. And, seeing that this is so, may it not be that we shall some day ourselves have reputations as likely to endure as theirs?

These considerations do not affect everyone by any means. In every age, fortunately, there are humble, inarticulate, unmeditative people in the world who find all the happiness and

interests they need in their immediate surroundings. They have no particular immortal longings. The beliefs that satisfied their fathers are sufficient for themselves. They are content. They live their little lives unappalled and often candidly bored by thought of the future. Nothing ever moves them to ecstasy. It is difficult for them to understand extreme love or extreme hatred, or, indeed, any passionate feelings at all. Poets and artists laugh at them; and they laugh back at the poets and artists, generally with greater justice. Certain is it that they are infinitely less to be pitied than the type of person who cannot enjoy in life the beauty of which he is passionately aware, for lamenting its transience or his own.

> But at my back I always hear
> Time's winged chariot hurrying near;
> And yonder all before us lie
> Deserts of vast eternity.

We now might substitute a state of nothingness for poor Marvell's deserts; but what would be the difference? Could anything be more typical of the modern attitude towards life than this same poem's ending?

> Let us roll all our strength and all
> Our sweetness up into one ball,
> And tear our pleasures with rough strife
> Thorough the iron gates of life:
> Thus, though we cannot make our sun
> Stand still, yet we will make him run.

In all ages people have been impressed with the frailty of our present existence and the bleakness of what lies beyond. Shakespeare gives frequent expression to the theme.

> What is love? 'tis not hereafter;
> Present mirth hath present laughter;
> What's to come is still unsure:

Gray repeats it, contrasting death with the 'warm precincts of the cheerful day'; and it finds an echo in Keats's *Ode to Melancholy*. But with these poets it was hardly more than the outcome of a passing mood. Now it is a solemn and permanent conviction. It infects the minds of quite ordinary people. It makes them seek in art the salvation that religion can no longer secure for them; it moves them to comment, and create.

There is something intensely pathetic in the desire that so many people have to-day to leave upon the world a mark of themselves, a sign that they have lived and perhaps sometimes been happy. Every year life becomes less solid to our imaginations, and matter more questionable. And yet, though conscious

that he must pass away and leave to others a world that is itself only a perishable thing, man still contrives to gloat over anything that he has done or said which may endure in the memories of those others a few years longer than his own flesh. It is possible, for instance, for one of the most popular of contemporary dramatic critics to announce in the course of one of his articles:

> I wrote a short story about the difference (between art and life) once. It took me seventeen years to write. I called it *When God Takes Off the Paint*, and even then no one took any notice, except Hall Caine. Now and then an old woman writes to me about it from New Zealand or somewhere, but otherwise it is unnoticed on some file in the British Museum. . . .

One of the main features of the age is its enormous self-consciousness. We are, of course, encouraged in various ways to believe that we are people of importance. To be able to speak, and have the echo of our words ringing round the world to New Zealand and the Middle West, would be a marvellous achievement, if only one could be heard above the noise of all the other people doing the same thing. Modern man has invented special precautions against fire and all other material means of destruction; the gramophone and the cinema perpetuate and multiply our personalities while we are still alive. It is thus possible to earn quite early in one's career the only form of immortality in which the non-religious can believe, and to flatter oneself into defying what Sir Thomas Browne calls 'the consideration of that duration, which maketh pyramids pillars of snow, and all that's past a moment.'

But we are not content with our triumphs. We must match them against those of the heroes of the past. We compare merely, and call it criticism. 'All the famous characters of history, from Edward the Confessor to Charles Peace,' shouts the waxworks man at the fair. But are the values of our supremely educated critics any better?

> Van Gogh [writes one of them] was one of the greatest figures of the nineteenth century. It is only with giants like Tolstoy and Cézanne that one can justly compare him. . . . Van Gogh was a saint more saintly than Tolstoy, because less self-regarding; more saintly than Newman, because more simple.[3]

Art criticism is perhaps not a fair test. M. Vollard, in his book on Renoir, relates how he saw a man standing before a reproduction of *A Woman in a Tub*, by Degas, in a shop window. The man exclaimed, 'A woman's torso like that is as important as the Sermon on the Mount.' Renoir said, 'He must have been

[3] Herbert Read in a criticism of 'The Letters of Vincent Van Gogh' in *The Times Literary Supplement*.

[illegible]." A painter would never talk that way.[1] But one sees the same tendency in literary criticism. An author cannot be simply himself now. He must be better than Lamb, bolder than Shelley, more amiable than Addison, or as brilliant as Wilde. He may be aware of his faults, but if he obtain a certain degree of proficiency the critics will not let him believe himself anything but a classic in embryo. He is encouraged to issue each new work of his expensively in a limited edition, each copy being printed on hand-made paper and embellished with his signature. He can thus best compete at Christie's and Sotheby's with the great writers of the past, who are the only rivals he is inclined to acknowledge.

There is to-day no hard-and-fast distinction between biography and fiction. It has been said often enough that everyone in the world has it in him to produce one good novel. One may call it a novel, but essentially the story would not be a novel at all, but an autobiography. It certainly does happen that an enormous number of the novels that are published now are first and last novels. The authors of these have only one story to give to the world, and that is the story of their own lives. They do not issue them as autobiographies, simply because the public will only readily accept the autobiography of an ordinary man if it is presented in the guise of fiction. Ordinary people are not the proper material for biography. The biographer must choose the best subject he can, and his choice is as restricted as his material. The novelist can delineate the essential nobility of the thwarted and the obscure; but then he does not have to rely, like the biographer, on facts that everyone can check. Ordinary people may be fascinating in themselves and fascinating to the novelist, but to the biographer they can never be as interesting as the great, simply because they fail to reveal themselves; their lives lack form and feature, and the contrasting tones that bring significance.

Ordinary people cannot hope, therefore, to stand out, as Pepys and Johnson stand out, in the light of a diary or a biography. Their diaries will diffuse no brilliance. Their biographers will be bored. But if they cannot be protagonists they can still perform. They can write novels about their own true personalities, or they can contrive to find a niche in the biographies of others. Boswell, in immortalising Johnson, could not help immortalising also hundreds of lesser men for whom he felt nothing but contempt, and it is not an entirely forlorn hope that tempts people to-day to imagine themselves perpetuated in literature—in fiction as well as in biography.

The introduction of actual living people into works of fiction has become quite an ancient device now, but it illustrates better

perhaps than anything else the modern craving for self-preservation. H. G. Wells has toyed with the idea, and Shaw gives it an entertaining twist when he makes Dubedat in *The Doctor's Dilemma* refer to himself as a disciple of Bernard Shaw. In a play it answers well. It brings one up with a start. It is definitely dramatic. In an historical novel it is practically essential if we are to be given any history at all. But what the author is really doing when he applies the practice to a novel of contemporary manners is to push that novel into the category of historical novels and offer his friends to the ages to come as evidence of the veracity of his narrative. And it is suggested that this process will be extremely gratifying to the friends in question.

One has only to call to mind, for instance, the following passage from the sketch of the Marquis de Chaumont in Harold Nicolson's *Some People*, which is doubly relevant here :

> A few weeks later we heard that Proust was seriously ill. He had been working at *Pastiches et Mélanges*, and the effort had exhausted him. De Chaumont came to see me in obvious tribulation, carrying a letter in his hand. I read the letter. It was from Proust, saying that he had written a short sketch in the manner of St. Simon and would Jacques mind if he figured in it by name ? The latter was embarrassed how to answer. He did not wish to offend Proust, yet on the other hand, well really . . . I said that I, for my part, would have been in the seventh heaven had Proust showed any inclination to insert me in *Pastiches et Mélanges*. De Chaumont said 'it moight be jolly well all roight for a foreigner, but moy mother would not loike it.' I told him that I had met his mother, and was convinced that she would not mind in the least. He was only slightly disconcerted. 'Then there is moy aunt, de Maubize. She 'ates Jews.' I began to get a little angry at this, and told him that I doubted whether Proust would live long, that he was the greatest living writer, that Jacques was sacrificing a free gift of immortality, and that what on earth could it matter about his aunt ?

'I told Jacques that he was sacrificing a free gift of immortality.' How futile it all is, and how pathetic ! We may say glibly that we do not believe in the immortality of the soul, but in our heart of hearts we dare not contemplate the day when the earth will know us and our reputations no more. We comfort ourselves with the thought of the great men of the past who have survived for some centuries. We measure ourselves up against them. Shaw cannot dash off a single play without shrieking, 'Isn't this better than Shakespeare ?' If it be ten times better than Shakespeare (which it is not), it will one day perish just the same.

Is all this the inevitable consequence of unbelief ? Surely not. Literature is no less perishable than any other kind of monument, and sooner or later we must face the fact. Popular

literature is always a generation behind the thought of its time. Our authors are still under the shadow of the last war; only now are those of them who actually saw active service coming into their own. The war brought the younger generations up to face, and almost to expect, sudden death; and life is never more desirable than when man first comes to manhood. It is then that he feels all emotions most keenly. It is then that he expresses himself most forcibly. The thought that to-day he is alive and to-morrow he may be dead adds more glory to the sun and gives the song of the birds a new and torturing significance. The war made soldiers poets because it made poets soldiers. It took away life and gave us literature, and that literature, we say, is the most glorious and enduring memorial the dead now have. It is necessary and honourable that those who die in war should be commemorated. It is not necessary—it is merely shameful—for people whose lives are without aim or interest to expect to be commemorated in the same way. Monuments are given most honour in times when life is precarious; in times of peace we must think it simply folly if people spend time and ink in working out the place they will occupy in men's thoughts when they are dead.

Furthermore, unbelief will not always govern men's minds. Popular literature will probably be materialistic in tendency for some years more, but materialism long ago lost savour with the really penetrating minds in the world. Scientists make their discoveries and their guesses about the machinery of the universe, but they know they will never discover why the thing works at all.

They are guided now to a large extent by faith, and the attitude most of them adopt towards atoms and electrons is nothing less than mystical.

ROBERT SWANN.

THE ORIGIN OF RIGHT

I

One person in every twenty-two—that is to say, an average of one cricketer in every match—is left-handed; and the other twenty-one have always seen something sinister and gauche in this physical declaration of independence. The double meaning which attaches to the words suggests that our moral ideas of right and wrong derive from the earlier physical distinction between right and left; and the suspicion is strengthened by the fact that religion adopts precisely the same standpoint in this matter as ethics. The good sheep are said to be assembled on the right, the wicked goats to the left; and the Apostles' Creed asserts that Christ sits on the right hand of God.

This right-handed attitude has permeated politics as well as religion. The party in power occupies the right, the party in opposition sits on the left, in every representative assembly. History, too, is littered with petitions and declarations of right, and paradoxically every demand for rights comes from the parliamentary left.

These things go down to the roots of human nature, perhaps even deeper; and as the origin of this attitude had never been investigated, I decided to make such physical observations as were possible, in the hope that they would throw light on various obscure points of action and thought.

The inquiry proved unexpectedly complex and prolonged, and involved an excursion into an entirely unexplored department of natural history. How far it was successful the following pages will show.

II

Being personally ambidextrous, I find it difficult to believe that I am particularly vicious because I prefer to shave or sharpen a pencil with my left hand, or specially virtuous because I generally use that same pencil with the right. These things are to some extent optional; a good many cricketers, for example, bat with their right and bowl with their left hand, or *vice versâ*. Such trivial matters seem obviously a matter of

individual preference and convenience. But, socially at least, they are not.

There is much more in this than the ordinary dislike of the crowd for the individual who dares to be different. These acts are taken as pointers and symbols of the general physical attitude of the individual, and the underlying truth behind the opinion which condemns them as sinister is the fact that the left-handed man is, and must nearly always be, something of a nuisance in team-work. He is in the minority, and therefore abnormal physically, and consequently we are inclined to think him abnormal morally and mentally.

But why is the left-handed man in a minority ? It may have been personal prejudice, but it seemed to me at the start that in a perfectly constructed world both right and left handed men should be in a minority, and that we ambidextrous folk should be the normal type. Life, however, has not been built on those lines, and the answer to that question raises some curious points of animal response and reaction to the world around us.

Most quadrupeds and reptiles couple the active foreleg with the opposite hindleg in walking, for the obvious reason that it preserves the balance ; the alternative is to become a hopper or bounder, like the kangaroo or squirrel—a method that is quicker for short spurts, but much more tiring over long distances, since it involves lifting the whole weight of the body at every step.

It is common knowledge that many men preserve a remnant of this alternative use of the four limbs by swinging the arm opposite the moving leg when walking. But I was surprised to find that the premier biped reverses the rule at starting. The majority of human beings have so definitely dextral an outlook that they are right-legged as well as right-handed.

The proportion of right-legged folk is certainly smaller than of right-handed : of seventy-two individuals observed entirely at random, forty-six used the right leg first to twenty-six the left, and similar but smaller lists compiled to check this ratio gave practically the same result.

There are two chances to one that a woman puts her right foot first in walking, and this is very much the same whether she rises from sitting down or resumes walking after standing still.

The ratio is less with men—presumably because military training insists on marching left foot first ; but six men out of ten stride forward right foot first. The proportion, however, of men who put the right foot first when rising from a chair is the same as with women, and it is only when men are already standing that they are more inclined than women to start off with the left—a fact which seems to confirm the surmise that Army regulations are responsible for this difference of the sexes, since a

regiment is already standing, not sitting, when the order to march is given. Indeed, if the great majority of men were naturally left-footed as they are right-handed, there would be no need to drill them left foot first.

III

Lower down the scale of life the variety is astonishing, and a long series of observations was necessary to discover the habitual attitude and approach of various types.

Dogs, like horses, make pretty equal use of left and right forefeet first; so far as one can see, it depends partly on the attitude in which the body has previously come to rest, and partly on the direction to be taken—the limb follows the purpose. But there is no canine or equine rule of 'right-about-turn' when doubling, and a dog will curl himself up right or left as the fancy takes him.

His cousin the wolf is, however, emphatically left-footed. I do not mean that a wolf will not occasionally, even often, start off right foot first; but it will use the left far more frequently—its whole angle of approach is preferably from the left, and in an open space it will advance in a left ellipsoidal movement, not a right.

The domestic cat, on the other hand, is right-footed, particularly when stalking a mouse or a bird; and the whole tribe of cats—ocelots, civets, genets, and cervals—climb right foot first and hold their food in the fore right paw in preference to the left.[1] Jaguars, lions, and tigers use both paws together to their food, probably because they are used to large carcases; but the dainty little kinkajou, which lives on carrots and bananas, picks up its dinner piece by piece, and, like good little boys all the world over, invariably conveys it to the mouth with the right hand. Indeed, its manners are so perfect that one almost expects it to use a table-napkin.

Of the larger quadrupeds, antelopes, like dogs and horses, appear to have no particular rule. But giraffes, like human beings, put the right foot forward twice as often as the left; elephants three times right to once left; and camels—at least when led—invariably start off right foot first. These facts were at first simply meaningless to me; but afterwards I saw reason to attach some significance to the coincidence that the animals with the highest vision, and therefore the farthest horizon, should have a predominantly right outlook.

Deer, on the other hand, almost always use the left foot first;

[1] The polecat, however, appeared to climb indifferently right and left foot first; and it chewed my lead pencil equally with the right and left side of its mouth.

and in this, oddly enough, the swift resemble the slow, for tortoises and terrapins of all kinds invariably put the left foot first ; and ven swimming turtles seem to use the left fore flapper under the water more than the right. Only once have I ever seen a tortoise start off with the right, but this does not, of course, necessarily mean an automatic swing to the left.

In order to test this, an obstruction was repeatedly placed efore my little daughter Joy's pet tortoise on the lawn. Conronted with a capsized deck-chair—a monstrous object which no ancestral instinct can have familiarised—the sagacious Timothy deliberated carefully, with the slow but sure intelligence of his ind, before he set forth in quest of his favourite rubbish-heap, idden behind a tall lavender hedge 80 feet away. Each time is sense of direction took him straight home, allowing for an ccasional turn and halt to swallow a dandelion ; and after six xperiments on different days he had defeated that deck-chair hree times by circling to the right and three times to the left.

After that I left him to his own devices ; so acute and wellalanced a mind, capable of finding his way home over what, ize for size, must have been about a level mile to a human being nd feeding himself *en route*, seemed more worthy of Professor pearman's psychological laboratory at University College than f my back garden.

The truth is that we are apt to think animals, like children acking in intelligence, simply because they fail to do what we ant them to do. But I have noticed that a little more patience n observation often shows them to be doing something they hemselves want to do ; and, judged from that standpoint, their ctions may be not less intelligent than our own.

It is necessary to keep this steadily in mind when studying nsects and other invertebrates. My own observations seemed o indicate that many of these possessed a great deal more inteligence than they are commonly credited with ; and perhaps it not very intelligent of us to label habits that we do not undertand by the convenient but occasionally meaningless epithet f instinctive.

Spiders, for example, which both prey upon others and are reyed upon by others, must lead very exciting lives, in which uick decision is essential to survival ; and, unlike the tortoise, hose shell gives it time to think, I found that every spider whose ath I obstructed on a level floor hesitated not a moment, but urned away instantly and instinctively to the right.

But they are certainly not incapable of what, in a human eing, would be called rational thought. A spider which I nprisoned in an overturned glass ran three times to the right, nd then alternatively to the left, in its attempts to escape.

Possibly its adventurous career makes it intelligent and ready to try experiments; and, moreover, every web presents a different problem in architecture, and close observation shows that there is a great deal of variety in the method of building.

For obvious reasons the web is usually in a site protected from rain and wind, and therefore preferably in the sun. But the mesh is sometimes woven from the centre outwards towards the circumference, and sometimes from the circumference inwards towards the centre. Again, it is sometimes spun from the hedge or inside, and sometimes from the open or outside; and I have also seen a spider alter its position abruptly from inside to outside when the web was half finished.

I could not see any reason for these differences, but it seems to me absurd to call them instinctive when they vary in so many particulars. In these matters the individual obviously suits her own fancy or convenience; and the only rule is that there is no rule at all of right or left, of inwards-outwards, or *vice versâ*, and only a slight preference for inside as against outside when building. But in walking on the ground the spider emphatically prefers right to left.

My acquaintance with beetles, apart from museum specimens, is unhappily less extensive than it should be. Unlike the spider, they generally turned to the left when the path was blocked, but after two or three failures they reversed and tried the right. I am not prepared to deny their intelligence. But I suspect that here, as in our own species, it is possible to have more beauty than brains. (If the poets had microscopes, they would sing the exquisite loveliness of this neglected order.)

Ants, like dogs and horses, seem indifferent to direction; but a solitary ant when obstructed (or even a small company) easily gets confused and runs around aimlessly. They are, however, more inclined to climb over an obstacle than go round; and here they resemble the earwig, which, like the young men praised by Samuel Smiles, has an insatiable desire to get to the top.

But the earwig earns my respectful admiration. Others have celebrated its affection for its young; I found it quick, resourceful, and cool in any difficulty. Confronted with obstruction, it darts either right or left in search of cover; but, having found a hiding-place, it will not enter at once, unless the danger seems imminent, but, like the famous British soldier in Flanders, looks round for a 'better 'ole.' If this is not forthcoming, it will return to its original discovery. If we did these things, we should call it intelligence; as it is only an earwig, we talk learnedly (and stupidly) about the mysterious nature of instinct.

An earwig which I dropped into a bowl of water swam at once to the nearest side and tried to climb out head first. Failing

to get sufficient purchase on the glazed surface when perpendicular, after several attempts, it approached the side diagonally, when its long body gave it a better grip, and clambered out sideways. It may have been only coincidence that it approached and came out on the right side; but as the earwig has an excellent memory it would probably be more likely to try a similar method and right-handed approach next time. An insect will ight for its life with the rest and the best of us, and from such hairbreadth escapes are habits sometimes born.

Flying insects contributed little to this inquiry. The curious flight of the common white butterfly is naturally zigzag, as though an automatic internal rudder impelled it to alter course very two yards or so; but this eccentricity is markedly increased when chased by a hungry bird, and it appears to be the butterfly's only form of defence on the wing. It is, however, effective in puzzling its pursuer, whose beak opens to catch the butterfly and closes on empty air; the 'daddy-longlegs,' which has no such actics, is a much easier victim.

A creature that flies zigzag can have no particular preference or right or left on the wing; it is the same with bees and wasps. But the mental capacity of hymenoptera seems to me somewhat exaggerated by popular philosophy. During more than one long summer afternoon I have watched them both gathering honey rom a tall lavender bed; they move up or down on the long talks, and either right to left or left to right indiscriminately, ver bushes already visited only a minute before by their coleagues. A better organised attack would have halved the work.

Birds, like flying insects, were of little use in this connexion. Light hoppers naturally hop—like Luther, they can no other. Heavier birds walk like bipeds, but pigeons, pelicans, ducks, geese, and other fowl use right or left foot first with complete mpartiality. Cranes and flamingos rest indifferently on either eg; of six which I observed in rapid succession three were poised on the right, three on the left leg. After that I gave up counting.

Fishes, which are the birds of the sea, have also no preference. The opportunity for observation is, of course, very limited, but, so far as one could tell from the aquarium, even the flatfish and the gurnard tribe are indifferent to right and left.

Very different from those purely negative results is the vidence of the mollusca. The earliest univalves (Ammonites) are simple curved cylinders. Subsequently the spiral developed bewildering variety of forms, with both right and left screws, and one anomalous type—Odostomia and other members of Pyramidellidæ—in which the young whorls are sinistral and the adult whorls are dextral.

But the right-hand screw has a marked preponderance over

the left—I have often gathered over 100 shells in succession on an open beach without finding a single sinistral specimen—and, although new examples of the left screw frequently appear in every geological period, Lyell states that the reversed or left screw is relatively much more common in the old Neocene strata, while the normal or right-hand forms increase in the Tertiary and modern period.

IV

Is there, then, as Matthew Arnold might have said, some force outside ourselves that makes for rightness as against leftness? Does the right-handed attitude or approach confer some advantage in the battle of life as against the left-handed?

From the evidence before us, it rather looks like it. With a large number of animals, of course, right and left are approximately equal, and equally used; and this applies particularly, as one would expect, to winged creatures. Birds are bound to preserve a head-on attitude; any tendency to lop-sided flight would probably bring more dangers than advantages in its train, and this is reflected by their general carriage when on earth. But with that part of the world which walks, crawls, or runs this does not appear to be so. Here a substantial minority of the many hundreds of cases I observed directed their activities, whether voluntary or enforced, to the left; but a clear majority evidently preferred the right.

But it is useless to sum up until all the evidence is before the court.

Now, there can be no question that the human attitude is not merely right-handed; this is in effect only a symptom of a general outlook on life from the left towards the right. Our arms and legs attest the former; our cameras and portraits demonstrate the latter.

Of fifty-six photographs in my possession I found that thirty-three heads were inclined towards the right, twenty-three towards the left. The professional in the studio may be suspected of posing his subjects to look better than they are, but no such reproach can be brought against the amateur, whose snapshots generally make us look worse than we are. And I find that out of twenty specimen snapshots taken by different people over several years twelve persons are facing right, eight left. For once, amateur and professional are agreed: the proportions are identical—three right to two left.

Artists are not always accurate observers, or at any rate reproducers, of ordinary physical fact. But a visit to the National Gallery and National Portrait Galleries, for the purpose of arith-

[illegible] rather than admiration, showed 152 portraits posed to th right to 129 to the left; about five to four.[2]

But how did this general outlook and approach of humanit towards the right arise? Why of 100 physical actions are sixty more normally directed towards the right and forty or less towar the left?

It is obviously not sufficient explanation to say that we draw paint, write, and fence [3] with the right hand because these actions like speech, are directed from the left hemisphere of the brai Indeed, this seems to me no explanation at all, for it puts the car before the horse.

Structure is conditioned by function, not *vice versâ*; an therefore our left cerebral centres, including speech, have pre sumably developed because we use the right side of our bodies i preference to the left. We can hardly suppose that in this on case we are in the presence of a biological exception, and that th function of using the right is dictated by the structure of th brain. Further, we have seen that it is our general attitude an approach to life, and not merely these specific activities, which turned towards the right; and on that ground alone it seem probable that these localised cerebral centres are more probabl the consequence than the cause of our normal outlook.

But in order to see if there was any evidence which bor definitely on this point I spent some considerable time in mor or less close company with our excellent cousins the lowe primates.

I found that baboons use right and left hand indifferently while drills grasp or swing equally with one hand or the other Both will take food with left as well as right hand, and convey to the mouth with either. The little capuchin will take (and break) food without preference of right or left. (All these animals have tails.)

The tailless orang-utan, on the other hand, makes more use o right than left; and the tailless chimpanzee is undoubtedl right-handed. 'Greedy Jimmy,' the chimpanzee at the Zoo, wil take every lump of sugar he is offered, but always with the righ hand. His colleague in a neighbouring cage, who amuses his to abundant leisure in breaking and peeling sticks, uses his left foot

[2] Some artists seem more right-handed than others. The two self-portrait of Reynolds at Hampstead and the Tate Gallery are both posed to the right; in his *Holy Family* the three principal figures are all on the right; in the *Three Graces* two figures are right to one left. This contrasts with Gainsborough, who has five portraits right to six left.

[3] Exceptionally the right-handed man boxes, as he bats at cricket, with left-forward stance. But in both cases defence is more important than attack, and therefore the typical attitude is reversed. Left-handed cricketers are more apt to slog; 'stone-wallers' are always right-handed.

to hold a twig down while he pulls it with his right hand till it cracks, and, in peeling it, holds the stick with his left hand and pulls the bark off with his right. In both cases the left hand is passive, or at most auxiliary, while the right is active; and his methods are precisely those of any woodman in any part of the world.

These facts do not particularly assist the theory that our right-handedness is due to the specialisation of the left hemisphere of the human brain—a theory which, even if true, would still leave the question open why the faculties of speech and writing should be concentrated in that cerebral section. On the other hand, they do rather suggest that our general physical outlook towards the right has been a gradual development due to some mechanical advantage which the right possesses over the left; and if that is so, the elaboration of the left cerebral hemisphere would be a consequence, not a cause, of our physical attitude.

This would, of course, be more in accord with biological principle. There is, however, no known mechanical law which favours the right over the left; the port and starboard engines of a steamer have the same push and pull,[4] and water will flow as easily through a pipe curved left as right.

The problem is therefore one which is peculiar to life, and to certain forms of ground and arboreal life; for neither birds nor fish nor flying insects show any preference for right over left.

What, then, is the meaning of this curious preference?

Let us assume—as seems inherently probable—that life was ambidextrous at the start, and that it found itself in a world in which every creature with limbs was free to begin each act with either right or left hand or foot. But of the first 100 actions it is improbable that exactly fifty would have been done by the left and the other fifty by the right. One side would have done more actions than the other, and that alone would have begun to form a habit and an attitude of looking at life. That habit would be economical of time and effort; the creature that stops to consider whether it shall begin every action with right or left is at a disadvantage compared with the rival that has formed a habit of operating from one side, and only using the other as an occasional alternative.

But the search for an efficient physical cause for this frequent but by no means universal preference was not an easy matter.

I take it we can dismiss such recondite considerations as that the sun rotates from east to west, and (north of the equator) at least appears to move from left to right, and that the slower

[4] Apart, of course, from the tendency of the ship to obey the set of the screw in actual navigation. Practically all vessels are built with the right-hand screw, but a very few have been constructed on the opposite principle.

wave-lengths of the spectrum are to the left and the quicker to the right. These things no more influence the ocelot or chimpanzee than the sacred ritual of passing the port; some more practical and proximate reason must be adduced for this twist of life to the right.

V

Many hypotheses occurred to me while these observations were being made which were abandoned almost as soon as formed; but one seems definitely to fit. I suggest that it is primarily a question of grip.

Let us see how the evidence consorts with this interpretation. The shell of the mollusc protects it from its enemies, and its grip (which is proportionately much stronger than that of a man) enables it to hold fast to the rock or stone which is its home. The shell grows with the animal which lives, so to speak, on the ground floor, so that the top whorl or original attic was built before the large establishment downstairs, and is sometimes left untenanted in adult life. The shell varies enormously in size and structure in different species, and even in the same species, but there is no particular reason, except one, that can fashion it from left to right rather than right to left. That one reason is that every house is conditioned by its foundations, and the shell must grow from left to right because the typical attitude of the animal is from left to right. But this in turn is conditioned by its grip, which is essential to its safety; and, since the majority of shells broaden from left to right, we must assume that the animal gets a better purchase with a dextral rather than a sinister twist; and this gives it a better chance of survival.

New sinistral shells appear in successive geological epochs, a fact which indicates that the door of free development is not definitely closed; but the majority of shells are dextral, and, so far as we can judge from the rather doubtful evidence of deposits from past ages, that majority appears to be increasing. But to this disputable point we must return later.

Higher up the scale the evidence, though less conclusive than one could wish, seems definitely to confirm the assumption that grip, whether for hunting or climbing, is the decisive factor in this left-right controversy.

Animals which use their limbs entirely for locomotion have no particular preference for right over left. One cannot get inside their minds, but the first foot used appears generally to indicate the direction in which they want to go, and, so far as horses and dogs are concerned, they are as likely to want to go left as right.

So far as I could ascertain, it was the same with the diggers, which grip only with their mouths. Stoats and badgers are not

easy to observe, but they seemed to use right and left forefeet indifferently, or preferentially both together, exactly as a do when throwing up earth and sand; and even the raccoon, which is very clever with its hands, generally uses both together (like squirrel) when eating.

Cats, on the contrary, are mostly climbers and hunters who grip their prey and kill it; and if experience has taught the whole tribe that the right forepaw gives a better hold, it would explain that foot coming first when stalking. The actual evidence I have is confined to the smaller felines—genets, ocelots, and so on—but if any reader who is hereafter chased by a tiger or a panther has the time to observe (and opportunity subsequently to record his observations) he will have added a little to this obscure subject.

The reptiles were of little use in this connexion; like the horse and the dog, they seize with the mouth, not the limbs, and therefore no question of grip arises. I was interested to notice, however, that two climbing lizards—the iguana and the monitor—usually put the right forefoot first when climbing a tree trunk or the bars of their cages, in exactly the same way that a man will climb a ladder. Possibly it gives the lizard a better purchase; but the opportunities for watching this particular act were too few for me to attach much importance to it.

However that may be, there is possibly some significance in the fact that spiders and earwigs, both of which are climbers, seem inclined to turn towards the right; while beetles, which seldom leave the ground, have no such preference. I confess that should not attach much weight to these particular observations—live beetles were extraordinarily scarce when I looked for them in my part of the world, and museum collections are, of course, useless for what is essentially a field naturalist's inquiry—but, so far as they go, they tend to confirm the impression that the grip required in climbing can be better obtained by a right than a left ascension.

When we come to the primates these odd hints and indications—which would be worth very little if they stood alone—become more definite. Apes and monkeys commonly use their hands to grasp and pull food towards them. But the lower tailed types use right and left indifferently; it is the higher tailless varieties that use the right more than the left. When one lives in a tree the loss of the prehensile tail of course throws more work on the hands; and the left hand appears to have been chiefly used for holding on, leaving the right free for climbing and manipulating.

Habit, like appetite, grows by what it feeds upon. The chimpanzee, like the mollusc, appears to have found that the use of the right gives a better grip; and the preference descended to

man, who has used his right hand and arm as principal and his left as auxiliary until the right has become indubitably stronger and generally larger.

How much stronger the human right is than the left is difficult to say, since it varies according to individual use. But perhaps a rough general indication may be found in the fact recorded in *Wisden's Cricketers' Almanack* that one William Yardley, a Rugby schoolboy, threw a cricket ball 100 yards with his right arm and 78 with his left.

In this case the right is to the left as five to four; and it will be noticed that this proportion agrees approximately, though not exactly, with the general right-left attitude exhibited in our photographs and pictures, where it is as six to four.

The exceptions seem to prove the rule. Horses use right and left indifferently, but horses neither hunt, grip, nor climb. Dogs use right and left indifferently, but they hunt with their noses, not their eyes, and neither grip nor climb.

Wolves also neither grip nor climb, and where they hunt they hunt in packs. Why a pack, like a regiment, should be left-footed defeats me. Possibly concerted movements may be easier that way, but I simply do not know. In any event, this does not apply to the tortoise, who, being deaf, lives in rather a solitary world; but the tortoise is left-footed, neither grips nor climbs, and only hunts lettuces.

To sum up this section of the argument. Not every animal that uses the right approach or the right foot first in preference to the left does so for the purpose of gripping, climbing, or hunting; witness the camels, elephants, and giraffes. But practically every animal that grips, climbs, or hunts uses the right approach or the right foot first in preference to the left; and this is surely a significant fact, which can hardly be dismissed as mere coincidence.

VI

But this only removes the problem a stage further back. There remains the difficult and more fundamental question why the right should give a better purchase, grip, or approach than the left. What exactly is the advantage conferred by the dextral as opposed to the sinistral attitude to life?

Here, as before, a large number of plausible ideas suggested themselves to me which had every imaginable virtue as theories and only one defect—that they did not fit the facts. There was, however, one explanation that presented itself, somewhat diffidently at first, but with continually increasing force as the evidence accumulated, and which I now venture to propose as an efficient cause for the origin of this preference.

Everybody knows that it is impossible to see distinctly with the sun in one's eyes. For clear vision one therefore turns one's back on the sun, and experience shows that sight is slightly more accurate when the sun is over the left shoulder than the right.

The reason for this is evident in bright sunshine. When the sun is over the left shoulder our eyes follow the light in practically a direct line, and any object which is along the line of vision is therefore seen in clear and sharp outline, under the maximum conditions of visibility.

But with the sun over the right shoulder our eyes look a little across or through the light, with the natural result that we are either slightly dazzled or the view is a trifle blurred or even distorted.

Every cricketer knows these facts; every shot acts upon them when he can. The best position in which to chase anything, to catch anything from a cricket ball to a dinner on the wing, and to grip firm hold of anything whether for sport or supper, is with the sun at one's back, and for preference behind the left rather than the right shoulder.

But this makes the dextral attitude predominant and instinctive in animals of aggressive type. Insensibly it comes to colour our whole attitude to life; so that in the end we use our right hand naturally as principal and the left only as auxiliary; while we put forward the right leg first in sympathy with the right arm, but less automatically and therefore less frequently, because it is on the whole easier to swing round as a unit in accordance with our general outlook rather than the other way in opposition to it.

Men know this as a practical fact who have never troubled to reason out the causes of the preference; and hunting and climbing animals—who, like ourselves, are mostly beasts of prey—appear to have found it out in the same manner, by discovering that a right approach was more likely to spell dinner and a left approach to spell hunger. And this perhaps explains why our anomalous camels, giraffes, and elephants are also right-footed; they are not beasts of prey, but their height from the ground gives them a wide horizon, and since they all live normally in a very strong light, it is important to use it to the best advantage and to avoid the dazzled or blurred effect of looking through or across rather than down and along the rays of the sun. These, then, also prefer the right to the left approach.

But if that is so, the localisation of the faculties of writing and speech in the left cerebral hemisphere of the human brain must have followed, and not preceded, the assumption of a right-handed attitude and a general dextral outlook on life by large classes of animals; for there can be no question, of course, from the evidence cited above, that the dextral outlook was adopted

pes that existed long prior to humanity. And the localisa-
of these and other centres in the left cerebral hemisphere
ld be a natural result of the dextral outlook, which has
ously been intensified rather than diminished in the case of
by the addition of speech and script.[1]

The actual visual advantage of a right over a left attitude is
arently not very great—somewhere in the proportion of five
x to four seems to represent the ratio—but it has been decisive.
e above arguments are correct, it has at any rate been suffi-
t to affect our physical attitude, our cerebral architecture,
our mental outlook from the very beginning with its
alpable influence.

VII

The theory advanced above as the cause of preference for the
sical right appears to account for every case mentioned except
mollusca. Here, indeed, is an exception, and apparently a
difficulty; for there is a far greater preponderance of right
left in univalve shells than among insects and mammals,
every mollusc known to science avoids the sun.

There is therefore presumably a far stronger reason for their
otion of the dextral twist than for the higher animals' adop-
of a right-hand outlook. But the physical cause, both of the
cidence and difference, is obviously different.

The text-books which I consulted simply stated the bare facts
the preponderance of dextral over sinistral shells, without
mpting to account for them. And I found that the problem
f involved a long and complicated investigation of what was,
e at least, an extremely difficult subject; I can therefore
put forward the conclusions which gradually formed in my
with the deference and humility proper to one who is in no
a professed conchologist.

No doubt here, as in the other cases, the problem is primarily
estion of grip—although of grip not so much for the purpose
tching as of avoiding being caught. The latter is indeed an
more vital matter than the former, for whereas anybody can
without dinner more than once and survive, nobody can be
e into dinner even once without losing interest in all sub-
ent proceedings. But even this increase of motive does
sufficiently explain the extraordinarily increased preponder-
of rightness over leftness among mollusca; nor—since the

[1] This dexterity—the very word betrays an ambiguity in the present con-
—extends even to trivial matters. A dentist informs me that people are
inclined to masticate on the right than the left side of the jaw; and every
-carriage and club smoking-room shows that more pipes are held in the
side of the mouth than the left.

influence of the sun is negligible in all save land mollusca, who detect it—can we look to light as the exciting cause.

But for the action of the sun we may reasonably substitute the action of water in the case of molluscs; with this difference, however, that the physical impact of water must have far greater effect on the shell than sunlight on land animals. The total weight of actual sunlight that falls on a human being during an entire lifetime is considerably less than an ounce. But the minimum weight of water supported by either salt or fresh-water shell in a still and shallow pool can seldom be less, and must generally be much more, than this at any one moment. The difference between the slightly dextral attitude of some land animals and the extremely dextral attitude of many molluscs must no doubt be ascribed to the fact that the former live in the lighter medium of air and sunshine, whereas the latter live in the dense medium of water.

Where the mollusc lives at great depths the pressure of water is vastly increased, but it does not have to withstand waves, and can therefore support life with a thin shell; but on an exposed beach, where great tides and currents and backwashes are constantly at work, the force of the water is multiplied by the velocity of its motion, and the shell will be thick and solidly constructed, with stream-lines made to lessen and break up rather than resist pressure.

Now, mollusca depend very largely on currents of water for their food.[6] They must therefore accommodate themselves to these influences, which are essential to their well-being, and the various modifications of structure give evidence of the manner in which they adapt themselves.[7] The top whorl of the shell faces the current, so that its slender apex breaks the force of the oncoming water, which slides over the bulk of the shell and presses the animal within against the rock or breakwater to which it clings.

The bulk of fixed marine life is found on the full tidal side of the current, which sweeps it in and forces it to cling to any projection or obstacle; on the slack-water side of a beach or bay the amount of life will be less. And it will at once be seen on comparing dextral and sinistral shells that the elongated dextral

[6] 'Currents carry nourishment to the bottom animals, and sweep away the finer particles of mud and other soft substances, leaving (in sounds especially) nothing but the bare rock, or perhaps a slight covering of coarse sand and shells. This enables attached forms to thrive, since the current prevents their being buried, and at the same time supplies them with the nourishment they require.' (Murray, *The Depths of the Ocean.*)

[7] It should perhaps be noticed that marine worms, which live in sand some inches below the tide, do not have thus to adapt themselves, and worm-casts at low tide are as likely to fall right as left.

shell, on account of its physical conformation, necessarily gets a better grip of a solid projection when the tide is behind it than a sinistral shell of precisely similar pattern, but with the screw reversed.

In the former case the lie of the whorl is with the current, the whole body of the animal is pressed downwards and forwards by the water, and the incoming tide helps it to cling to its support. In the latter the lie of the whorl is against the current, and, unless the incoming tide strikes the shell from below instead of above, the formation of the mouth of the shell places the animal at a disadvantage in holding on, and it is obviously much more likely to be washed away.

Now, in my experience, no incoming tide on an open beach comes up from below, like the water rising in a spring or a river at the flood; sea tides strike the beach in the form of waves from above. It may be said that the sinistral shell might be located on the top of a rock which is just covered at high water, in which case the tide might possibly lap it gently from below. But in that event the lie of the whorl is still counter to the current, and this explanation allows nothing for the difference between spring and neap tides. Even granting that possibility, the area open to colonisation by the sinistral shell would be very limited—which is not a fatal objection, in view of the small numbers found—but its life would be very precarious.

So far the argument is easy; we have only to assume that the sinistral shell made a false start in life and failed to prosper, and has therefore given place generally to its more efficient brother, the dextral shell, which began right, continued right, and lived happily ever after in the path of righteousness.

Unhappily, in abolishing the sinistral shell, or at least rendering it an uninsurable proposition on an open beach, we seem to have proved too much; for I hold one in my hand as I write, and I have only to walk a couple of miles along the shore to pick up a dozen. Like the young lady who vanishes, clothes and all, from the stage when Mr. Maskelyne says 'Go,' only to pop up in the audience a moment later, we have no sooner demolished the sinistral shell in theory than the wretched thing reappears in practice, with the inconvenient question of the tombstone:

> If so quickly I was done for,
> What on earth was I begun for?

How, in fact, did the whorl counter to the current come into existence at all? What is a shell built to deal with a tide coming in from below doing on a beach which has never seen anything but a tide coming in from above?

This is one of Nature's own enigmas; but even the riddle of

the Sphinx had an answer, and the secret of the sinistral shell can hardly be insoluble. I therefore put forward a suggestion which seems to offer a possible solution of the problem.

Sinistral shells are undoubtedly found at various places on the shores of the North Sea; and those particular waters have from time immemorial swept down south from the Arctic with the incoming tide and swung northwards again with the outgoing tide. With the currents as they are, it seems to me mechanically impossible that a mollusc with a left-hand screw could have been formed, and physically impossible that such a mollusc could have survived on an open beach.

But there are two possible contingencies in which the formation becomes mechanically possible and its survival physically probable.

(1) If the North Sea be regarded as merely the lower mouth of the Rhine, and the Arctic itself were frozen to a lower latitude than to-day, the weight of water from the north would be less, and a condition would exist in which the major current would usually be reversed and a riverine ebb set in which would periodically flow more strongly from the south than the diminished oceanic flood from the north. The general shallowness of the North Sea does not render such a contingency impossible, and the demonstrably changed courses of East Anglian rivers in recent geologic times lends some support to this view, and makes such a change of current seem not improbable.

The coast of England must then have been some miles further east, and apparently formed a flat and more or less amphibious region over which the tides would sometimes have washed gently from above, and sometimes have welled up from below through the spongy mud. In such conditions the sinistral shell could not merely have existed, but have flourished.

The whorl is no longer against, but with, the current. The incoming tide sometimes washes over the animal from above, and sometimes presses upwards from below. And finally the lessened capacity for grip caused by the physical conformation of the mouth of the shell is no longer of importance; for the animal is not, in fact, exposed to the buffeting of heavy waves, and it does not have to hold on tightly to a rock or a breakwater, but lives peacefully on the soft clay; and how closely sea clay clings only those who have walked on it know.

(2) But it is not really necessary to reverse the current of the North Sea to construct a suitable habitat for our sinistral shell. The North Sea flows in from the Arctic every day, and the *débris* it brings down with it has choked and cloaked some of the rivers of eastern England, as the mouths of the Yare and the Ore sufficiently testify. But the tide flows up the East Anglian rivers

twice a day, and as the current sets in from the north its major force breaks upon the south or right bank of the river as it presses upstream.

Within the river the tide flows strongly, but less in waves beating from above than in ripples rising from below. The current is not reversed, but its force is moderated and its direction changed by the fact that the ocean current is from the north or north-east, whereas the lie of the East Anglian rivers (like the Thames) is roughly from west to east, or rather north-west to south-east. In these circumstances, again, the sinistral shell is equipped for the battle of life. The whorl is with the current, the tide presses up from below, and the animal can grip its support with sufficient firmness for all practical purposes of molluscan existence.

Which, if either, of these two assumptions is correct must be left to those more competent to decide than myself; in optimistic moments it has even seemed to me that both might possibly have some truth in them. For the fact is that the sinistral shell is found in abundance in places where it might have

(*a*) Simply remained stationary where it lived and died;

(*b*) Been washed out to sea from a neighbouring river, driven a little southward by the North Sea current, and thrown up on the flood tide; or

(*c*) Been washed out from the river, sucked along to the north through the old river channel—now a deep—on the ebb, driven again south by the normal set of the ocean current on the flood, and finally thrown ashore in a south-easterly gale.

These possibilities are not mutually exclusive: in my opinion (*a*), though the simplest, is slightly less probable, whereas (*b*) and (*c*) are both in constant operation as regards ordinary *débris* every season. It should be added that the sinistral shell seems to me slightly less stoutly built than its dextral brother, which supports the assumption that it has to bear less weight of water; but on this point I should not like to be dogmatic. And, further, the extreme rarity of the sinistral shell would be accounted for by the fact that its opportunities of distribution would be limited to the peculiar conditions I have described; but where these conditions occur it is not infrequently found.[8]

VIII

If these facts are correctly stated and interpreted they cannot but induce some strange reflections. The actual superiority of

[8] I hazard the guess that the mollusc Odostomia, referred to in a previous page as being sinistral in youth and dextral in adult life, may begin life in a tidal river and subsequently put out to sea.

right over left is slight, and due to two separate physical causes which only affect certain classes of life; but it seems to have been sufficient to determine the physical attitude of practically every gripper and climber and hunter, from mollusc and monkey to man; and in our case the preference, which physically can be stated as a mere five or six to four, appears to have influenced not only the general attitude and outlook of the race, but to have directly affected the local structure of the brain, and to have coloured our legal, ethical, and religious phraseology as well as our common daily speech.

A. Wyatt Tilby.

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the Nineteenth Century and After, 10 *&* 12, *Orange Street, Leicester Square, W.C.* 2.

Letters as well as articles will be considered for publication, but letters should be confined to criticism or amplification of articles which have already appeared in the Review. No anonymous contribution is published.


"BRYMAY"
SAFETY MATCHES
British Matches
for
British Homes
MADE ENTIRELY IN ENGLAND
IN BRYANT & MAYS MODEL FACTORIES

FEBRUARY

[illegible] Three-Party System . . . By F. J. C. H[illegible]
(Professor of History, King's College, [illegible])

[illegible] of Production . . . By J. [illegible]
(Professor of Economics, Leeds [illegible])

[illegible] Educational Survey: V. The Profession of a Teacher
By BEATRICE C. MULL[illegible]
(Headmistress of Sherborne School for [illegible])

[illegible] Dispute between Russia and China . . . By CHING-CHUN WA[illegible]
(Director-General of the Chinese Eastern Railway, [illegible])

The Future of Sea Power: A Speculation . . . By MELVIN F. TA[illegible]
(Lieutenant (S.C.), U.S. [illegible])

[illegible]anada's Outlook . . . By GEOFFREY F. [illegible]

[illegible]ndians in South Africa . . . By W. [illegible]

The Church of England in Jerusalem . . . By MAJOR FOLSO[illegible]

Brussels a Hundred Years Ago . . . By THE COMTESSE [illegible]

Overseas Mechanical Road Transport . . . By R. F. [illegible]

The Dawn of Mining . . . By J. W. GREGORY, D.Sc.
(Professor of Geology, Glasgow Univ[illegible])

[illegible]ommercial Vegetable Culture . . . By SIR WILLIAM [illegible]
(Governor, John Innes [illegible])

The Problem of the Family . . . By MEYRICK [illegible]

A Tenth-Century [illegible] . . . By PROFESSOR F. A. W[illegible]

Time, [illegible] and the Modern Novelist
By F. MELIAN STAWELL, [illegible]

LONDON: CONTEMPORARY REVIEW CO. LTD., ORANGE STREET, LEICESTER SQUARE, W.[illegible]

PARIS: [illegible] NEW YORK: [illegible]

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

CONTENTS FOR FEBRUARY

LONDON: CONSTABLE & COMPANY LIMITED, 10 & 12 ORANGE STREET, LEICESTER SQUARE, W.C. 2.

PARIS: MESSAGERIES HACHETTE, 111, Rue Reaumur. NEW YORK: LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION CO.

Registered for Canadian Magazine Post.

Price Three Shillings. *All rights reserved.*

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
AND AFTER



No. DCXXXVI—February 1930

THE THREE-PARTY SYSTEM

I

Important as are many of the particular problems which confront present-day politicians, there is one general constitutional question underlying them all that immeasurably exceeds them in gravity. It is the question whether or not the government of this country shall continue to be conducted on the three-party system which prevails at the moment. This question is more important than any particular problem that faces either Parliament or people, because it relates to the method and machinery by means of which all particular problems have to be settled. It raises the fundamental issue between democracy and oligarchy; between majority and minority rule; between the will of the people and the craft of the conjurer.

At the present moment minority government prevails. On the one hand, the representatives of 8,362,594 Socialist electors hold it in office over the representatives of 13,965,190 Anti-

Socialist electors (8,664,243 Conservative and 5,300,947 Liberal). On the other hand, 59 Liberal members of Parliament hold the balance in the House of Commons between 287 Socialist members and 260 Conservative, thus exercising an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. So great, indeed, is their power that they hold the fate of the Government in their hands. If, for example, they had been united and had faithfully followed Mr. Lloyd George's lead in the division on the Coal Bill in December, they would have forced the Cabinet to resign. As it is, they compel the Cabinet to make all sorts of unwelcome concessions in order to win their support for the Bill in Committee. Similarly in respect of the Unemployment Bill, the Liberal handful—presumably in the hope of re-establishing themselves once more as the people's party—with complete irresponsibility, lure Labour on to bestow extravagant and demoralising doles on wastrels who are genuinely *not* seeking work. In vain do the responsible Ministers endeavour to keep some sort of check on the permanent establishment and endowment of malingering. Their hands are forced by their microscopic but potent foe. In short, the erratic and apparently unprincipled course of the Liberal remnant in Parliament destroys all the calculable in politics, and entirely nullifies the will of the majority both of the members in the House and of the electors in the constituencies.

II

The Liberals, not content to remain the irresponsible minority that exercises control over the responsible minority that constitutes the Government of the country, wish, not unnaturally, to enjoy in their turn the sweets and emoluments of office. In order to do so they are anxious completely to remodel the electoral system of the kingdom. They point out that under any sort of scheme of proportional representation they would now have 140 members in the House instead of 59. It is not easy to see how this would benefit either themselves or the country. They would be no nearer office than at present; the Socialist Government would be even weaker than it is to-day; the Liberal third party would be no more responsible than it is now, and would be even more potent for mischief. The Liberals probably hope, however, that, if they can secure the adoption of some sort of proportional representation, or alternative vote, or second ballot, at some distant day they may get back to office. For they insist with iterated emphasis that they are not going to vanish from the parliamentary scene. On the contrary, they say that the day of the two-party system has gone for ever, and that three parties

henceforth will remain perpetually on the electoral field. This is the question that I propose to consider.

III

There are some political idealists who object altogether to any kind of party system, whether the parties be two, or three, or many. They say that party breaks the unity of the nation; that it lowers to sectional ends loyalties that would otherwise be devoted to the interests of the whole community; that it introduces conflict where co-operation would be more appropriate; that it causes a needless discontinuity of policy; that it generates envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness; that it obstructs much useful legislation and furthers the passage of many pernicious measures; that it excludes a large number of able men from office and raises to eminence and power a multitude of incompetent windbags; that it destroys individuality and independence in politicians, and gives control to the caucus and the boss; that it subordinates patriotism to factional passion. Such are a few of the arguments against party advanced by Bolingbroke in the eighteenth century, Brougham in the nineteenth, and Belloc in the twentieth.

No careful student of the history of political party will contend that these arguments lack weight. If one were seeking and expecting to find a perfect form of government, entirely free from all objections, one would not set up the party system as a model. But in this mundane sphere, in respect of administration, man has no more than a choice of evils. All he can possibly decide is whether or not any alternative form of government has not still more serious disadvantages than the party system. The only alternatives to this system are—(1) autocracy, (2) oligarchy, and (3) that specialised form of the latter known as bureaucracy. Each of these has drawbacks so markedly more formidable than those attendant upon the party system that no one who inherits the British tradition of freedom and self-government could readily prefer any one of them. For—and this is the vital point—the party system is essential and inevitable in any and every effective form of democracy. No party system, no workable mode of democracy.

IV

That the party system is the indispensable concomitant of democracy is recognised by nearly all the great students of representative institutions. 'Party,' says Walter Bagehot, 'is of the essence of parliament—bone of its bone and breath of its breath.' Sir Sidney Low concurs. 'The division into parties,' he says, 'is

in fact essential to the operation of our constitutional machinery. The eminent American publicist, Professor A. L. Lowell, remarks to the same effect: 'Democracy in a great country, where the number of voters is necessarily large, involves the permanent existence of political parties.' Even the Prussian absolutist, Heinrich von Treitschke, expresses the same deliberate judgment. 'An unprejudiced study of history,' he admits, 'shows that party is a political necessity for a free people.' Quotations of a similar kind could be produced almost without limit.

If we ask why almost all publicists and political philosophers agree that party, in spite of its admitted defects, is inseparable from parliamentary government, we find that they reply to the following effect. In a democracy the isolated individual is impotent. In order to give effect to his views and desires he must associate himself with those who think as he does, and with those whose interests are the same as his own. 'How can Demos speak without organisation; and how can Demos be organised without party?' asks Professor W. J. Brown. The case is put with conclusive force by Mr. Stephen Leacock in his excellent book on political science:

> The rule of the people [he says] can only mean the rule of a majority. Now the only way in which any particular set of people can remain together as a majority, and thus render possible a stable and consistent administration of public affairs, is that the members of the ruling group shall 'agree to agree' with one another. A modern democratic State without this somewhat artificial and yet essential unanimity would become a brawling chaos of individual opinions.

The successful working of party necessitates regimentation, discipline of a military character, much suppression of individuality. Thereby, no doubt, it involves some loss of enterprise and initiative—some quenching of genius; some extinction of novel ideas. But, as compensation, it simplifies and clarifies political issues; it brings questions forward in such a form as admits of their being answered; it educates the democracy by the only means in which it is capable of receiving instruction; it makes political opinion effective in action. Rightly says Mr. Ramsay Muir: 'Our whole representative system turns upon the unending warfare of organised political parties.'

V

When it is admitted that party organisation is necessary for the effective working of democratic government the question arises, How many parties should there be in order that the parliamentary machine should operate most satisfactorily? To this question there are really no more than a couple of answers.

On the one side there are those who contend that representative government is efficient only when the number of parties is two, and not more than two. On the other side there are those who advocate government by temporarily associated groups. The so-called 'three-party system' is not in a separate category; it is merely the smallest possible specimen of the group system. It is, moreover, an exceedingly unstable specimen of the group system. It marks merely the beginning, not the end, of the disintegration of the two-party system. The present Liberal group, small as it is, shows unmistakable signs of fissure. As Mr. Lloyd George lamented at a Liberal lunch on June 13 last, whenever in the preceding session the division bell rang 'four Liberals voted Conservative; twelve voted Socialist, and twenty-four ran away.' Deep lines of separation, indeed, tend to sever the Liberal group into sections. The other two parties, moreover, are by no means homogeneous. If the disintegrating group principle were once admitted, the Conservative Party might well split into Protectionists and Free Traders. As for the Socialists, they are already divided into many shades of pink and red. There is, in truth, no telling where the process of schism might end; for in the last resort *quot homines, tot sententiæ*. When once the discipline of party is broken down, each individual tends to go off and plough a lonely furrow.

Now the multiple-party or group system has its defenders. Treitschke, for example, faced in Germany by more than a dozen kaleidoscopic cliques, says that the two-party system would not suit the German genius: the Germans have too sublime a love of truth to be dichotomised; they have too deep a devotion to merit to limit office to two sets of demagogues! Most of the publicists, however, both of Germany and of France, where the group system prevails, lament its existence, and recognise the evils that it brings in its train. It means unstable government, irresponsible oppositions, unscrupulous log-rolling, unprincipled compromises and accommodations, cancerous corruptions. In Italy and in Spain it has brought democratic government to a ruinous end; even in France and in Germany it has involved it in deep discredit.

England, the home of parliamentary administration, has until the present day remained steadily faithful to the two-party tradition; and her fidelity to this tradition accounts for the fact that in England parliamentary administration has been more successful than in any other country. It is true that third and even fourth parties have from time to time appeared upon the political battlefield and displayed their little banners; but invariably, after a brief interval, from one cause or another, they have vanished, usually by absorption into one or other of the two great armies. The prevalence of the two-party system in

England is, in truth, no accident; nor is its persistence a matter of mere fortunate chance. The two-party system in England originated in war, and it has continued as a form of sport. To say this is not in any way to disparage it. Party conflicts are war without bloodshed; countings of heads instead of breakings of them; hurlings of arguments in place of bombs; sheddings of ink in lieu of gore. They are, moreover, forms of sport free from frivolity; games of skill and chance only in that they are pursued according to rule, and ordered by codes of honour. The two old English parties, Whig and Tory, sprang from the militant Roundheads and Cavaliers who waged the civil war of the seventeenth century. In that war, as in all other serious struggles, there was no place for permanent third parties. All who were not either Roundheads or Cavaliers had either to stand aloof altogether or else to suppress their idiosyncrasies and join one side or the other. Men like Falkland might hesitate for long, but ultimately they had to make up their minds whether to remain out of the struggle altogether or to adhere to one or other of the two armies. Permanent third parties in war are inconceivable. They are equally inconceivable in sport. What would football or cricket be like with three teams on the field, all playing at once? What would be the condition of a game of tennis in which, besides the parties in the courts, there was a third party at the ends of the net, rushing in to intercept the ball? Much the same sort of confusion results in Parliament when third parties spring up to disturb the interchanges of Government and Opposition.

VI

It would be interesting and instructive at this point, did space permit, to summarise Mr. G. W. Cooke's *History of Party*, with additions to bring it up to date, tracing the process by which in turn such third parties as the Jacobites, the 'Boys,' the 'Bloomsbury Gang,' the Chathamites, the Shelburnites, the Canningites, the Peelites, the Adullamites, the Irish Home Rulers, the Liberal Unionists, emerged, disarrayed for a time the set-pieces proceeding on the political stage, and then were removed by the management. To do so, however, in adequate detail would demand a dozen articles. One third party, however, played so important a *rôle* in its day, and provided so close a parallel to the present condition of things, that it cannot be passed over. That was the Radical Party which took shape during the conflict over Wilkes and the Middlesex election in 1769. Like the Labour Party in 1893, it rose outside Parliament, and outside the old political organisations. Like the Labour Party, it gradually made its way into the House of Commons, winning recruits and securing

leaders (e.g., C. J. Fox) from among the more advanced section of the Whig Party. Like the Labour Party, it drove many of the more moderate Whigs (e.g., the Duke of Portland) into Conservatism. Ultimately it extinguished the old Whig Party, absorbing all such of its members as had not become Conservatives in a new composite 'Liberal Party.' Until the two-party system was fully restored—and this did not take place until about 1865—British politics were hopelessly confused and chaotic.

The two-party system, indeed, is vital to the smooth and efficient working of the parliamentary machine. This elementary truth is stated in unequivocal language by a long succession of constitutional authorities whose words I should have liked to quote had space allowed. Among them are Lord Bryce, Professor Henry Sidgwick, Sir Sidney Low, and Dr. A. L. Lowell. So recently as June last, in the *English Review*, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher observed that 'in our own country effective parliamentary government depends on the two-party system.' One writer, however, has distinguished himself above all others by the eloquence and emphasis with which he has stressed the necessity of the limitation of parties to two. That writer is Mr. Ramsay Muir, both of whose masterly works, *Peers and Bureaucrats* (1910) and *National Self-Government* (1918), should be consulted by those interested in this theme. In the earlier work he denounces the group system; condemns the electoral device of proportional representation precisely because it is destructive of the two-party system, which, he says, is 'quite fundamental to our system of cabinet rule.' He further observes that 'it is when the great parties break up into shifting groups, not pledged to steady support of the Government, or to persistent opposition, and therefore capable of being tempted by the promise of gain, that corrupt bargaining will begin to appear.' It is in the later work, however, written when the Labour Party was the third party, that Mr. Muir deals most fully with the menace of the three-party system. Would that his weighty words could be pondered by the present Liberal Party! The two-party system, he says, is 'the only system whereby parliamentary control of the Executive can be made effective' (p. 29). He warns us that 'a coalition of shifting groups involves log-rolling and corruption' (p. 29). He drives home by striking examples the significant fact that 'whenever smaller groups were formed by scission from the two great parties, they always tended to be merged again in a very short time' (p. 158). He observes that 'the two-party system is a real safeguard against a decline in the standard of public rectitude' (p. 160), and ends his impressive—indeed, conclusive—argument by enumerating (pp. 160–5) six merits of the two-party system which counterbalance all the defects that may be incidental to it.

Briefly summarised they are as follows :—(1) It ensures stability and coherence in the government ; (2) it secures the maintenance of an incessant and watchful criticism of all legislative proposals ; (3) it acts as a safeguard against political corruption ; (4) it serves to simplify and clarify the issues of national politics ; (5) it identifies policies with prominent leaders—*e.g.*, Home Rule with Gladstone ; (6) it inspires politics with the fine and honourable spirit of sport, and gives it the interest of an exciting game. The two-party system, he concludes, is ' one of the vital elements of the British Constitution ' (p. 165).

VII

To the powerful arguments for the two-party system advanced by Mr. Ramsay Muir many others might be added. On the theoretical side it might be urged that when any problem is analysed into its constituent elements, when issues are disentangled, and when the ultimate questions are put one by one, two answers alone are conceivable in each case—either an unqualified Yes or an unqualified No. And this argument might be reinforced by the consideration that there are only two lobbies in the House of Commons, so that, however loudly third parties may assert themselves on the hustings, in Parliament they are bound to be either disintegrated or absorbed. On the practical side it might be demonstrated that the two-party system is the indispensable prerequisite of a strong democratic Administration ; that under it alone is a responsible Opposition possible ; and that it is the only mode in which the rule of the majority can be effectively attained.

The three-party system, and *à fortiori* the multiple-group system, means minority government ; it means a weak Executive ; it means an irresponsible, divided, and ineffective Opposition ; it means unstable and short-lived Ministries ; it means perpetual temptation to log-rolling and corruption.

So deadly a menace to the British system of government and to the spirit of the English Constitution is the three-party system that it is safe to say that the electorate will not reduce itself to futility by allowing it to continue. The electorate, moreover, if it is wisely led, will refuse to permit itself to be cajoled into experimenting with proportional representation, or alternative votes, or second ballots, or any other of the devices by means of which minorities try to secure the advantages of majorities. For all these complicated and delusive devices merely increase the probability that the two great parties will be supplanted by numbers of ideological groups.

The return to the two-party system is the prime condition

of the restoration of sanity and stability to British politics. Personally the present writer much wishes that the return could be to the old Liberal and Conservative Parties. But that return is obviously impossible. Labour, whether Socialist as at present or non-Socialist, has clearly come to stay. It is the Liberal Party that has got to disappear. Happily, the disappearance of the microscopic and dwindling Liberal Party does not mean the disappearance of the great principles for which it used to stand—the principles of individual liberty, civil equality, economic freedom, religious emancipation. The function of the expiring Liberal Party is to liberalise both its opponents : it has already begun to do so. In particular, its immediate task is to wean the Conservatives from their fatal proclivity towards Protection, and to deliver Labour from its Socialistic obsession. The final disappearance of the Liberal Party will probably signalise the final triumph of the principles of Liberalism. The party will perish because its work is accomplished ; it will die in a phœnix-like transformation.

When the end will come it is impossible to predict. The analogous transformation of Whiggism, under the pressure of Radicalism, was a very long-drawn process. But events move more rapidly to-day than they did in the Victorian age, and probably the extinction of the Liberal Party, as such, will take place at the next General Election. All that is necessary to effect that extinction is the emergence of some tremendous issue which will force the electorate to cease to play the game of triangular duels, and compel it to give a plain Yes or No to some great question presented to it by Destiny. Whether that question will relate to finance, or to India, or to Russia, or to an impending war cannot be predicted. But it is impossible to doubt that a day of judgment is at hand which will sharply divide the people of this country into two sections which, whatever be their names, will correspond to the two parties that from the seventeenth century have controlled the business of the British Empire.

F. J. C. HEARNSHAW.

COAL PRODUCTION

It is not unlikely that the present year will witness a profound change in the organisation of the coal-mining industry, not only of Great Britain but also of Europe. There are three countries in Europe which normally produce more coal than they consume. Of these Great Britain and Poland supply their own requirements and export the balance. The third, Germany, regularly imports coal but exports more than it imports. The remaining countries either (as in the case of Denmark) import all that they consume or (as in the case of Holland) produce less than they consume and import the remainder from the three exporting countries.

The German industry is controlled by syndicates, of which the Rhenish-Westphalian Syndicate is far the most important and controls approximately three-quarters of the total output. In some parts of the German market the syndicates enjoy a monopoly, but in other parts, such as the region around Hamburg, they are faced with the competition of other syndicates or of other countries. It is well known that the Rhenish-Westphalian Syndicate adjusts the price in contested areas to the requirements of the market, and that the competitive price in such areas is usually below the monopoly price in the non-contested areas of Germany. The Polish industry is controlled by a convention, which is a looser type of organisation than the Ruhr syndicate, but appears to retain an effective control of prices. The Polish industry enjoys a monopoly within the national boundaries and, like the Ruhr industry, charges lower prices in foreign markets.

Between the years 1919 and 1926 the coal industry of Great Britain was working under such abnormal conditions that it was impossible to discover real trends and to estimate the more or less permanent position of the industry. In 1920 and 1921 the industry suffered from stoppages; in 1922 output and exports were stimulated by a stoppage in the United States of America; in 1923 and 1924 the industry experienced a boom in consequence of the occupation of the Ruhr by French troops and the disorganisation of the German industry; in 1925 it suffered on account of the over-valuation of the English pound and the return to the gold standard; in 1926 the longest and most serious

stoppage in the history of the industry took place. During this period (1919–1926) the condition of the industry was examined by two Royal Commissions and one Government Committee. When the Sankey Commission of 1919 conducted its investigation Europe was still short of coal, while the currency of this country was seriously inflated. The task of the Commission was to provide a method of control which would secure peace in an industry which appeared likely to enjoy a period of great prosperity. When it was decided to release the industry from Government control and to introduce a wages agreement under which wages would fluctuate with the proceeds of the industry the wages controversy was focussed, not upon the minimum wage, which was regarded as merely of academic interest, but upon the ratio in which the net proceeds were divided between labour and capital. But the boom in trade was followed by a severe depression, and when, in 1921, the Wages Agreement came into operation it was found that the national minimum was of more importance than the precise ratio in which the proceeds were divided. The agreement was revised during the boom caused by the disorganisation of the German industry, and the wages controversy was now centred upon the national minimum wage. In 1925 the Macmillan Committee was called upon to investigate the wages problem. But the Government finally decided to grant a subsidy which would enable the industry to escape the immediate consequences of the return to the gold standard. Then followed the Samuel Commission, which carried out an extensive investigation into the economic position of the industry and made certain recommendations relating both to wages and to organisation.

It has already been stated that during the whole of this period the industry suffered from influences which prevented a close estimate of the probable future of the industry. During the same period, too, there was a serious conflict of principle between the mine owners, who contended that wages should be determined by district conditions, and the workers, who fought to maintain the principle of a national minimum. The conflict resulted in the stoppage of 1926, after which the national minimum was abandoned and district wages agreements were established.

Since the end of 1926 the industry has been working under what may be regarded as ordinary commercial conditions, and it is possible, as the result of three years' experience, to estimate the permanent influences upon the industry and the changes that have taken place in the volume and direction of trade since the outbreak of the World War. The situation may be summed up very briefly. The total production of Europe between 1913 and 1928 fell from 605,300,000 tons to 593,800,000 tons, but the production of Great Britain fell from 292,000,000 tons to

241,300,000 tons per annum. The fall in British output was due partly to a fall in home consumption, but mainly to a fall in the export trade. Between the years 1923 and 1927 production on the continent of Europe showed a marked upward trend, but in Great Britain it fluctuated without showing any real improvement. Last year there was a considerable increase both in British output and in British exports, and we are now asked to believe that this increase in the volume of trade represents the beginning of an upward trend. This view seems to me too optimistic. The year 1928 was an exceptionally bad year, and the subsequent improvement was due in part to a real increase in the demand for industrial coal. But the exceptionally severe winter of last year found Europe bare of stocks, with the result that the frost and snow caused considerable suffering. This lesson was taken to heart, and over a large part of Europe considerable stocks of coal were collected in anticipation of the present winter. The increase in the volume of trade in 1929 was undoubtedly partly due to this fact. Europe now appears to be well stocked with coal, and the cautious observer will assume that last year's demand will not be repeated during the present year. If, as is likely, the increase in demand is checked, market prices will tend to fall, and speculators will prefer to draw upon existing stocks and wait until the slump has reached its limit. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the present position of the coal-mining industry of this country has not undergone any substantial change.

When we examine the foreign markets for British coal we find that the fall in exports since 1913 has been widely distributed. Our trade with a few countries, such as Belgium and Holland, has slightly increased, but in the great majority of the markets it has fallen appreciably.

The greatest fall has occurred in our trade with the Baltic States, partly on account of the collapse of the Russian market, but also partly on account of the remarkable growth of Polish competition in Denmark and Sweden. Poland is undoubtedly the centre of the European picture. When the new State was created Germany feared a shortage of coal and stipulated that supplies should be sent from Poland. It was found, however, that Germany, so far from suffering from a shortage of coal, was sharing the depression in trade due to over-production. Since 1925 Polish coal has been excluded from that country, with the result that the Polish industry was compelled to secure markets elsewhere. Coal was sent along the "corridor" to Danzig and exported to Scandinavia, where it was sold at a price beyond the reach of the British industry. The export of Polish coal to Scandinavia cannot be regarded as a temporary factor in the

European situation. A second railway is being constructed along the corridor to the port of Gdynia, and it is reasonable to assume that in the absence of an international agreement the exports of Polish coal will tend to increase rather than to diminish. Under the terms of the commercial treaty which is now being negotiated between Germany and Poland the latter will be permitted to send approximately 4,000,000 tons of coal per annum into Germany, but it is likely that the additional supplies will be found from an increase in output rather than a partial withdrawal from the Scandinavian market. In the Reparations agreement Germany is required to send large supplies of coal to Italy and France. She has been able to fulfil the agreement partly by increasing output and partly by developing the lignite industry. Between 1913 and 1928 the annual consumption per head of coal in Germany fell from 2·34 tons to 1·94 tons, while that of lignite increased from 1·38 tons to 2·61 tons. The growth of the lignite industry has intensified the difficulty of the European coal problem. Holland increased her output of coal in the same period from 1,900,000 tons to 10,700,000 tons. Wherever we turn on the Continent we find that there has been an increase not only in capacity but also in actual production, and that our position in nearly all the markets of Europe and of South America has grown weaker. Europe as a whole is suffering from the existence of an overgrown industry. In Great Britain the producing capacity has increased since 1913 from approximately 290,000,000 tons to approximately 330,000,000 tons per annum, while the demand for British coal has fallen from 290,000,000 tons to approximately 250,000,000 tons. Such is the problem to be solved.

There are four main coal-producing areas in Great Britain—namely, Scotland, north-east coast (Northumberland and Durham), South Wales, and the Midland area. In all four districts attempts have been made to arrest the decline in the export trade. Wages were reduced and the hours of work increased. But the extent to which labour costs have been reduced in this way varies between different districts, and is most pronounced in Northumberland and Durham and in Scotland. The reduction in labour costs made possible a reduction in price and thereby increased the competitive power of the industry as a whole, but the growing disparities in the conditions prevailing in the different districts also resulted in a considerable change in the direction of domestic trade. Thus, for example, the industry on the north-east coast was able to capture a considerable amount of trade in the south of England which was previously in the hands of the Midlands and South Wales, and the difficulties of such districts were therefore correspondingly increased. This change in the

direction of domestic trade is a factor of the first importance at the present time. In the Midland area, where the miners work a shorter day and wages are relatively high, an association was formed in 1928 for the control of output and the stimulation of the export trade by means of a subsidy. The Central Collieries Commercial Association controlled approximately two-fifths of the total output of Great Britain, and its formation thus constituted an experiment of the first importance. By means of the subsidy it was able to recapture a considerable part of the export trade that it had lost, and by controlling output it was able to arrest the fall in prices. But it suffered from two serious weaknesses. In the first place, it was a voluntary organisation, and suffered from the fact that about 10 per cent. of the output of the area was produced by non-associated firms which, by working independently, were able to cut prices and secure a full complement of contracts. In the second place, it suffered from the competition of other districts, not only in the southern markets, to which reference has already been made, but on the competitive fringes of the producing areas. It was clear to the leaders of the association that complete success could not be achieved until similar organisations had been established in other districts, all the non-associated members had been persuaded to join, and co-operation had been established between the district organisations.

The view of the leaders of the Central Collieries Commercial Association has now been endorsed by the Government. The Coal Mines Bill provides for the establishment of district organisations and a national committee for the purpose of co-ordinating the work of the districts and adjusting any inter-district differences that may exist. Before the issues raised by these proposals are considered it is desirable to draw attention to one further development in the region of voluntary organisation. I have already referred to the fact that the scheme of the Midland Association provides for the payment of a subsidy upon exports. A subsidy is a weapon of economic warfare, and economic warfare is the alternative to co-operation. The leaders of the association realised that the process of adjusting the producing capacity of Europe to the requirements of the near future would be extended over a long period, and that in the meantime all parties would be seriously weakened and the capital of the industry wastefully employed. It was felt that international co-operation would produce the desired result more effectively and quickly and with less injury to the industry. For that reason informal discussions took place between individual leaders in the Midland area Poland and Germany. These discussions led to official conferences in the summer of last year, and in the second week of last month the conference with Polish coal owners was resumed and a

document was signed containing 'heads of agreement.' The joint memorandum issued in the summer and the document, containing heads of agreement, issued last month may be regarded as the beginning of international co-operation for the purpose of regulating prices and conditions of sale. It is not too much to expect that in due course a body representing the British industry as a whole will enter into definite arrangements with the Polish and German industries which will enable all three to escape the consequences of wasteful and ruinous competition in an industry which has outgrown the needs of the world.

It has been said that the Coal Mines Bill provides machinery whereby both output and prices will be controlled. It is further proposed that the marketing organisations shall be empowered to subsidise the export of British coal if and when such a subsidy is deemed advisable, and the fund for the provision of such subsidy will be secured through a levy on output. If international agreements are established and made effective, the provision for a contingent subsidy becomes merely of academic interest. On the other hand, if international competition is to continue, the subsidy may play an important part in the future of the export trade of this country. But it should be observed that the section of the Bill relating to the subsidy merely secures that the organisations which are to be set up by Act of Parliament shall have the powers which they would in any case have enjoyed if they had been established upon a purely voluntary basis. If no such provision is made in the Act it will still be competent for the national association or the district associations to provide for a voluntary levy and the payment of a subsidy from the fund thereby established. The main difference between the two alternatives is that in the first case the levy would be enforceable upon all coal owners, while in the other case it would only be paid by those who entered into a voluntary agreement.

The real controversy revolves around the proposal to control output and prices. The control of output necessitates the establishment of a basic tonnage for all establishments and a quota which will vary from time to time according to the state of trade. The operation of the quota system presents serious practical difficulties which it would be folly to ignore or underestimate. These difficulties, however, have not formed part of the subject of the controversy, and I do not propose to consider them in this article. They belong to the sphere of internal administration rather than to that of general policy. Critics of the Bill assert that the quota system is wrong in principle. By distributing production over all the units in the industry it tends (we are told) to dissipate energy when the great need is to concentrate effort upon the most efficient units. It creates a strong vested interest by giving the

uneconomic mines a statutory right to produce the amount represented by the quota. For these reasons it raises the cost of production and perpetuates the existence of uneconomic mines, or alternatively, if the latter are to be eliminated, loads the remaining units with a burden of dead capital employed in the purchase and closing of the uneconomic mines. Some alternative scheme must be found, and the alternative proposed by some critics is an increase in efficiency by means of compulsory amalgamation.

Before considering the objections that have been urged against the principle of output regulation through the establishment of the quota system a brief comment may be submitted upon the possible alternatives. Those who believe in allowing the force of unregulated competition to produce its inevitable result have had their way for eight years. Experience abundantly shows that the owners of inefficient coal mines may struggle for years before accepting the inevitable, and that in the meantime their struggle causes serious and undeserved injury to the more efficient competitors. The mills of competition grind very slowly. If the industry is to be left to the mercy of unregulated competition the present state of affairs may continue for another eight years. The industry of one country will only enjoy accidental and fictitious prosperity if and when trouble arises in the industry of another country. The hopes of some coal owners in this country have recently been raised even by the fact that they have benefited by the strike in the Australian industry.

The second alternative is to increase the efficiency of industry through amalgamation. Amalgamations may be on a purely voluntary basis or enforced by Act of Parliament. Compulsory amalgamation may mean either enabling a majority desiring amalgamation in any district to coerce the minority, or the selection by an outside authority of a group of mines which appear suitable for the purpose, and the enforcement of amalgamation irrespective of the desires of the owners. A discussion of the relative merits of these three classes of amalgamations is beyond the scope of this article, and it may be assumed that the type most likely to increase efficiency is selected. It should be observed, however, that, in the first place, the process of amalgamation will inevitably be slow and that a considerable period of experiment and reorganisation elapses before any amalgamation produces much effect upon efficiency. For this reason, even on the most optimistic view of the value of large units, at least three years would elapse before an amalgamation movement could be expected to produce any social benefit. In the second place, in so far as the amalgamation movement was successful in increasing efficiency, it would intensify rather than solve the immediate problem created by the existence of an industry far larger than is required. In so

far as the efficiency of other countries was not increased it would improve the competitive position of Great Britain, but, in view of the existence on the Continent of syndicates able to pursue a policy of price discrimination, even the improvement in the relative position of the British industry might not express itself in any improvement in the export trade. The alternatives that have been suggested fail to distinguish between the urgent need of Europe as a whole and the ultimately important need, in the interests of social progress, for increasing the efficiency not only of the coal-mining industry but of every industry and of every form of economic effort.

The statements of those who argue that the quota system would establish vested interests through the creation of statutory rights are somewhat vague. At the present time every coal owner has a legal right to produce as much as he likes, and the effect of the Bill will be, not to create a right which does not now exist, but to restrict a right which is now unrestricted. The new right which will be created by the Bill is that of preventing competitors from producing that percentage of the total output which is represented by the quota of the individual coal owner; in other words, the latter is given a right to produce a given percentage of the total output, or alternatively to transfer that right (if he does not wish to exercise it) in return for a money payment. But the Bill does not provide a guaranteed market for the quota, and in that respect the proposed system differs from the system employed by the German syndicates, which not merely grant quotas to individual coal owners but actually purchase the amount of coal represented by the quota. It is therefore clear that the question whether the quota system will create a value in excess of the present surrender value of an uneconomic mine will be determined by the price policy pursued by the organisations which the Bill proposes to establish. If the associations exercise their power wisely there is no reason to suppose that artificial values will be created far in excess of the existing 'nuisance values' of uneconomic mines. Moreover, in so far as such values are paid, production will actually be concentrated upon the more efficient units, with the result that the actual cost of production will be so much below the present cost as to make it possible to find the capital necessary for the purchase of uneconomic mines while actually reducing the burden upon the industry as a whole. Further, if the quotas to be established are based upon the right principle, there will be no tendency for the quota system as such to distribute widely that volume of production which is now concentrated. One of the difficulties of the present time lies in the fact that production is not concentrated, and that the so-called uneconomic mines are actually receiving a

larger share than can be justified by their relative cost of production. The history of the quota system in Germany suggests that it expedites rather than retards the process of concentration. I do not suggest that this is an inevitable and universal result; what I do suggest is that it is a result that can be achieved by the exercise of wisdom on the part of those who control policy, and that the tendency to perpetuate existing organisations, irrespective of their efficiency, is largely influenced by the price charged by the controlling authority.

The considerations that have been set forth in this article seem to me to point to the conclusion that the marketing machinery provided in the Bill is necessary as a first step in the reorganisation of the coal-mining industry. International competition has resulted in a fall of export prices to an uneconomic level without an appreciable increase in the volume of trade. The most urgent need of Europe is international co-operation for the purpose of restoring such prices to a reasonable level. International co-operation cannot be secured unless and until a national unit is established in this country. A national unit must be based upon district organisations, and district organisations with a 100 per cent. membership can only be brought into existence through coercion. The national and district organisations will be able not only to enforce international arrangements, but also to regulate the volume of production. They will not necessarily increase the efficiency of the industry, but if they are wisely led they will pursue a policy which will secure that result. It will thus be seen that the Bill proposes to place a heavy burden of responsibility upon these organisations, and whether real progress will be made will depend upon their policy. The interests of the more efficient firms are largely identical with those of the community, and one may reasonably expect that the policy of the new authorities will be wisely determined. Not only are the criticisms of the Bill less weighty than they appear to be at first glance, but the alternatives to the marketing proposals contained in the Bill offer so little hope of early improvement that by contrast they make the case for organised marketing even stronger than is commonly supposed.

J. H. Jones.

AN EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

V. The Profession of a Teacher

What we call education is a failure . . . rich female children, formerly imprisoned in the family dungeon under a wardress called a governess, are now sent out like their brothers. The result is a slightly greater facility in reading and writing, in the habits and speech of the rich idle classes, and a moral and intellectual imbecility which leaves them politically at the mercy of every bumptious adventurer and fluent charlatan, who has picked up their ways and escaped their education, and morally on the level of medieval robber barons and early capitalist buccaneers.—Bernard Shaw.

The reputation for mediocre intelligence which he enjoys,—enjoys is the *word*, for the Englishman does appreciate his position as a slow thinking man . . .—Salvador de Madariaga.

Anti-intellectualism is our chief national failing. There seems to be a notion that cleverness and knavery are near akin. The apparent stupidity of the Englishman is a useful camouflage, but it is not a thing to be proud of, and it has very nearly ruined us again and again.—Dean Inge.

No profession in the world is more criticised at the moment than that of a teacher. They are blamed for the result of their work; for the revolt of youth, its irreverence, its insubordination, its distaste for home. They are blamed for the demands of the schools, for the ever-growing taxation, for the discontent of parents and employers. They are indeed between Scylla and Charybdis. Mr. H. Hodge last month in this Review warns them that '*no people talk so much or so often about their own business as the professional teacher*,' but that the repulsive character of their professional vocabulary seems to eliminate everything that has life or soul. When the most distinguished members of their own body join in, they must indeed bow the head.

Schoolmasters have been in the past the butt of literature and the subject of derision in every form which it can take, from good humour to anger and bitterness, because as a profession they have deserved it, and for so long a period from Tudor to Modern days fell short of any ideal which men can honour and respect.[1]

But one criticism is surely open to question: 'There is not encouragement to take up education. Nobody will take much

[1] *The English Tradition of Education.*

interest in your work or your hobby if you do.' I should like to maintain that there is one class in England which does take an intense interest, and that is the British parent. It is true that the four able articles in *The Nineteenth Century* for January deal almost exclusively with the education of one sex, and whether it is that even the father has more 'views' about his daughter's mental state than his son's I know not; but thirty years' connexion with a public school for girls convinces me that interest, friendly sympathy, even unbounded trust, the British parent will bestow on any teacher, who he thinks is honestly trying to solve the baffling problem of his daughter's upbringing. It is more than probable that he might endorse her epitaph as 'misguided but well-meaning,' that he may unwittingly undo in the long holidays much that she has done in the term, but his *wish* to co-operate and understand is most genuine. I for one would welcome the formation of that small committee of laymen who shall wrestle with the three great questions: What are we aiming at? Where are we? Whither are we tending? May I make two further suggestions: (i.) Should not a member of this committee be a parent, or at least a guardian? (ii.) When they have had their discussions, can we not have a round table conference, and a small representative body of educationists be deputed to hear the solutions they have arrived at? One of the great dangers of the present day is the split between school and home. Whilst the teachers are 'a class apart' and yet are the only ones who really know the race of the future, how can the danger of disintegration be averted?

Two serious charges are made against English education. The first is that it fails conspicuously in dealing with what Dean Inge calls our chief national weakness—anti-intellectualism. In a modern novel there is a sympathetic description of an English officer at the front: 'There was not a sport at which he did not excel—of *Art, Religion, Science, Business, Politics,* Colonel X knew nothing and cared less.' (The italics are mine.)

In Professor Salvador de Madariaga's recent suggestive book on comparative Psychology a comparison is worked out between the English, French, and Spanish types. He takes three key words to denote the special reaction to life found in the three nations, but characteristically they seem untranslatable in the three languages. They are—

> Fair play in the Englishman.
> *Le Droit* in the Frenchman.
> *El Honor* in the Spaniard.

A sympathetic and even admiring analysis follows of the Englishman as the successful man of action, but there are other striking

remarks. 'The empirical spirit of the race manifests itself in the unpopularity of the intellectual boy, the "brainy" fellow, as well as in the tendency to shun intellectual work and cultivate sports.'

Let us imagine that the English convert the whole world to their philosophy, and that, moreover, they persuade the world to adjust itself to their ways. What would be the result? The earth would become an immense tennis-golf-cricket-swimming club, with elegant and simple clothes, mediocre food, excellent roads, magnificent sanitation, and impeccable police. Sundays a little dull perhaps, but first-rate week-ends, and not too strenuous weeks in between. Good humour, a sprinkling of wit, and even at times cleverness, though in moderation, and worn, so to say, with tactful decency. Greek known, but half-forgotten; Latin on the visible horizon; an extensive reading of bad novels, some conversation about those recognised as good. In all, a pleasurable world for the well-to-do, and therefore for the others, whose main pleasure would be to look at them. Plenty of physical movement, but moral adventures reserved for the few. Men would learn the experience of things rather than that of their own selves.

As regards girls' education criticism takes a somewhat different line. In the days of Jane Austen things were simpler. 'To teach is to retire from all the pleasure of life, of rational intercourse, equal society, peace and hope, to penance and mortification for ever.' Charlotte Brontë could write: 'My sister had to taste the cup of life as it is mixed for the class termed governess.' When Miss Augusta Platting, daughter of Sir Miles Platting of Chelsea, was a patroness of education we understand her point of view: 'I am re-modelling one of Queen Anne's charity schools. I am in great need of a pious, modest, industrious young female to teach small children and mend their clothes.' But now the whole outlook has altered. 'The vast majority of girls' schools . . . are still floating in the backwash of Victorian rationalism and utilitarianism . . .' 'Our modern girls' schools appear to be founded upon masculine ideals.' A vehement controversy is in progress about the school-leaving examination. Some deplore the number of failures on the ground that it is too academic for many girls and boys. The Headmasters' Conference suggested solving the problem by a separate test for boys and girls; but the real causes seem much deeper than a question of examination. A modern novel which was described by a masculine critic as 'one of the most penetrating studies of English girlhood in our literature' speaks thus of the heroine:

She had absorbed and passed examinations in all the branches of information suited to her age and condition, and made no use of them whatever.

In no other country on earth could you find a girl so competent with her hands, so deliberately circumscribed in her mind . . . her real enthusiasm was for boys' games . . . she did not deny her sex, she wanted to ignore it.

But all this is remarkably like the criticism we have noticed of her brother, the public schoolboy.

We are forced to the uncomfortable conviction that numbers of boys and girls leave our schools never having learned to think: that they often show practical ability, a certain way of getting things done, but that there is in them no real respect for knowledge, no power of logical reasoning, and no thoughtful interest in the history of their country; that, incidentally, they are totally unable to speak any language but their own is not satisfactorily explained by our unmusical ear and dislike of foreigners. It has been pointed out that whereas an Athenian audience (many possibly unable to read or write) would yet sit spellbound before the masterpieces of Æschylus and listen to the speeches of Demosthenes, our youth crowds to music-hall and cinema, and seems the prey of the cleverest demagogue. I venture to think that the most important recent utterance on the whole subject is to be found in *The English Tradition of Education.* 'No one,' says Sir Michael Sadler, 'is better qualified than Dr. Norwood to speak of the present position of the public schools. . . . Not many headmasters have written in this way about their work from their own workshop.' This most important book must be read as a whole, and especially for its inspiring chapters on 'the things that may be.' It should be noted, however, that it contains a confession that there is some truth in the present-day criticism.

> Athens, delivered from Persia, flowered forth in pioneer achievement in architecture and sculpture, history, drama, and philosophy: England, delivered from Spain, flowered in the genius of Shakespeare. But Great Britain, delivered from German hegemony, educated but industrialized, flowers forth neither in art, nor music, nor drama, nor thought, nor any form of literature. The crowded Cup Tie, the throngs gaping and betting on 'the dogs,' the packed cinema—in these a democracy, which has shown itself in action truly heroic, shows itself incapable of accomplishment in the things of the spirit, and proves that its education so-called must have been either wrong or imperfect, a thing of quantity only, and never of quality.

Later the same writer speaks of that respect for knowledge which the nation does not possess, and as yet has never possessed—'the average Englishman does not regard it as at all important that he should gain as much knowledge as he can for the purpose of efficient conduct of life.' The book, however, is very far from being despondent or merely destructive. Definite lines for a better future are laid down in 'the things that may be,' and there is one pregnant sentence which should be specially noted. The writer speaks of a promised land which may be entered—an age of control and security which may be reached; but he adds it

will depend upon knowledge and upon education whether this opportunity of that more favourable life will be used or missed. 'It will mean handing our life over to the guidance of those who know, not to those who are amateurs at improvisation, however brilliant, or to those who, with stoical perseverance under hard knocks, are content to muddle through.'

Theoretically, a professional training should be enforced for the would-be teacher in a public school; practically, the young graduate does get a post without it, and begins to 'muddle through.' It is not all exaggeration which pictures schools 'where the teacher who hates her work is shut in with a crowd of unwilling, hostile, restless children.' Certain unpleasant novels on school life have appeared recently. We may put them down in disgust as exaggeration and unlike any school of which we have any experience. Greater knowledge, it is feared, might modify that verdict. Certain points must be reluctantly conceded as true. Many teach in girls' schools who dislike their work and would gladly do something else. They drifted into it as a means of living and only realised too late their unsuitability. Others get disheartened through the sense of failure and nerve strain.

As things are in this country anyone may set up a school and begin to teach if he or she can find pupils. Some thirty girls of ages varying from eleven to fourteen were recently received in a public girls' school. They had been educated previously at considerable expense in private schools, preparatory schools, or by governesses. They had all been taught French for some years. Of the whole number only eight had learnt *avoir* and *être* correctly; about eleven could write well; only ten showed evidence of having been trained to think clearly. A test was given to a number of girls of about the same age at an elementary school. It revealed that as regards neatness, writing, and the spelling of ordinary words the latter were far superior. In ordinary elementary principles of arithmetic they were much more accurate. The homes of these children were in a small town, where there would be little or no intellectual stimulus.

However much we deplore the large classes, the limited outlook, and the other difficulties of the elementary schools, the children there have the enormous advantage of teachers who have been trained, who have learned the A B C of their profession; and the extraordinary waste of time would never be allowed which goes on in some places where the parents pay 200 guineas a year. The much criticised common entrance does exercise a certain amount of control over the preparatory schools for boys. If their pupils never get into the great public schools they may as well close. But this check is much less powerful over the

preparatory schools for girls under fourteen. Many a parent still hears with a shock of surprise that his daughter has failed to pass the entrance paper for the school he has selected—that, in plain language, she knows at fourteen less than his gardener's little daughter of twelve, that she has never learned to concentrate or think logically, and, worst of all, that no intelligent interest has been awakened in any subject, and that the time lost will never be made up. Even more serious cases occur occasionally, and it is suggested that a child is mentally deficient when she is only rather lazy and wholly uninterested, or when the discipline has been too bad for any work to have been possible. Yet parents still entrust their little girls to places where 'amateurs at improvisation' are in charge, where there may be no time-tables, no morning prayers, no Scripture teaching—in a word, where even the most brilliant of educationists are experimenting with costly material. All criticism then comes back to the one point—the question of the teacher. Mr. Hodge's last paragraph endorses this: 'The teacher undoubtedly is the greatest factor in education next to the taught'; and this should be understood in the widest sense. It includes the elementary teacher, the only person 'who has touch with and knows the real mass of the people'; it includes those in infant and nursery schools who do, it may be, the most honourable, most critical, most permanent work; and, last, it includes the ever-increasing rank and file of those who have entered the profession during the last eight or ten years—that is, since there has been the possibility of a living wage and a suitable pension. Do they not one and all require the very best preparation for their work which the wit of man can devise? They should be philosophers with depth of thought and many-sided interests; they should be artists with delicacy of touch and skill in execution; they should be idealists with breadth of vision and a sense of vocation.

May we, therefore, in conclusion consider some of the points which a good professional training should include. Obviously one of the first is to ensure an audible and pleasing voice, a command of good English, unspoilt by colloquialisms or accent. No teacher can expect to be a success without clear utterance and a knowledge of voice production. English does present certain special difficulties. Whilst calling us a 'purely empirical people,' Professor Madariaga notices that it even affects our dealing with such a subject as language. Whilst an *English* humorist observed that French was the language in which it was most difficult to speak the truth, the Spaniard considers it a debatable point whether there is such a thing as an English grammar, since whatever rules may be said to exist are 'so rusty and exception-eaten.' As regards pronunciation, he notices 'considerable

[illegible]? ' Should you say "[illegible]" or "[illegible]"?' a Yorkshireman was asked, and he answered, 'You can say "nother".' Again we say, is this a fair criticism? In a certain university, in a department wherein the majority were probably destined for the profession of teaching, there were only a very small per cent. who could speak without a marked accent. Posts are sought, and often obtained, by those who know nothing of voice production, and whose use of slang is unpardonable. Can we wonder at the rapid degeneration of the language and the criticism which this provokes abroad.

Further examples may be found by observing the peculiar character of English vowels. ' Vowels ' I have said, in order to humour for a while a general delusion on the subject. The English language is supposed to have many vowels. I believe they have even been counted and estimated at twenty-six. This is mere science. The fact is that there is only one English vowel or, if preferred, only one vowel-mass, a vowel-cloud, a vowel-sea, a vowel-nebula. It is universal and protean. It is now broad and dark, now sharp and pointed, now deep and musical, now dry and short, now stiff and opaque, but it is always vague and always ambiguous and shifting, so that it hardly ever ends as it begins, and it seems always to be turning up from somewhere, appearing for a time, then withdrawing somewhere else, dragging along with it bits of uncomfortable consonants. The English vowel-nebula is the true representative of the English empirical mind, always fluid and in process of becoming, only in actual use at the fleeting moment of the present which action fills, and even then, always ready to compromise.

Another essential of training is to produce teachers who have the power of arousing interest in the subjects they teach. This is the element of bitter truth in Mr. Bernard Shaw's words:

It is gravely injurious both to children and adults to be forced to study any subject for which they have no natural aptitude unless some ulterior object which they have at heart gives them a factitious keenness to master it. Mental disablement caused in this way is common in the modern examination-passing classes. Dickens's Mr. Toots is not a mere figure of fun: *he is an authentic instance of a sort of imbecility that is dangerously* prevalent in our public school and university products. Toots is no joke.

He goes on to hint at something nearer the mark when he speaks of ' the common case of a vindictive hope that Beethoven may be expiating a malevolent life in eternal torment is that of the normally musical girl,' who, to put it briefly, has been taught in a completely unscientific way. People do exist with a complete lack of sympathy with the developing mind and devoid of affection for the child himself—such should be firmly advised to avoid the profession; but they are few compared with the many who blunder through ignorance and inexperience, the typical English who think they can muddle through. Whatever be the cause, ' to be dull is the cardinal sin of Instruction.'[1]

[1] Herbart.

But our supreme need is for an increasing body of teachers who look upon the profession as a vocation. In the year 1895 a great pioneer of education was carrying on a scheme of her own. With the foresight which characterised all her work she saw the country would ultimately recognise that the public school teacher needed professional training just as much as the elementary. She organised a many-sided training department which at one time certainly numbered 130 students. This included preparation for work amongst little children (the examinations of the Froebel Society were taken) as well as the teaching of girls of ordinary school age. Finally Miss Beale started a class for those who wished to take up elementary work.

The whole atmosphere was keenly alive with educational interests, and new theories and problems were discussed. Miss Beale herself did three things. She heard and criticised the students' lessons; she had a special Scripture class for teachers and students, and she took the trouble to correct herself the work written for it. She gave special lectures to all who were preparing for the profession of a teacher. The latter made an indelible impression on her hearers. Two thoughts come back after many years. We should see children, not as they are, but as they will be; we must look beyond the humdrum present to the vast possibilities and hope of the future.

Ours may be a mediatorial ministry—it is our supreme chance to lead youth to the vision of the True and the Beautiful. When the toil up the mountain was ended, and Dante, in his sublime dream, had reached the rolling spheres of light, he was conscious of a subtle change. He found the things of this world receding as he passed into the blue glory of the Empyrean, and he wondered why he rose so easily, why the pull of this lower earth had weakened. Then at last he knew, it was a new force, the lost Guide of his youth was there:

I looked on Beatrice, and she on Heaven.

This is one of the world's true myths. It is by the personal touch man rises. As our children see in us 'the light which never was on sea or land,' they too will rise into Freedom, and Truth, and Beauty.

B. C. MULLINER.

THE DISPUTE BETWEEN RUSSIA AND CHINA

SINCE last July China and Russia have been massing troops along the Manchurian frontier. Intermittent clashes and sporadic fighting, including the use of tank, artillery, air, land and naval forces, have been taking place, with the loss of thousands of lives. Several Chinese frontier towns have been razed to the ground, three Chinese and two Soviet gunboats have been sunk, and Hailar, an important Manchurian town 150 miles from the Siberian border, was attacked by the Red army on November 24. We may not call this war, but it certainly is not peace.

The universal question in the mind of thinking people has been, What are China and the Soviet fighting for? What is all this meaningless and nameless war about? These questions are pertinent, because the cause of this fighting, killing, and invasion is nothing more than the appointment of one man as manager of the Chinese Eastern Railway, a single-track railway of 1067 miles. As may be recalled, soon after the coup of July 10 the Soviet demanded the restoration of the *status quo*. China refused that demand, because for China to reinstate the Soviet railway agents discharged for plotting against her, as Minister Wu put it, would be comparable to the action of a mistress in reinstating a cook whom she had dismissed because of attempts at poisoning.[1] Numerous proposals and counter-proposals have been made, and finally the terms settled down to this. The Soviet said it must appoint a Soviet agent as manager of the Chinese Eastern *before* the opening of negotiations. China agreed to the Soviet's demand, but said the appointment must be made *after* the opening of negotiations. The Soviet replied No and the recent invasion took place.

It may be remarked, in this connexion, that while the Soviet was insisting that China should fulfil certain conditions prior to the opening of the Russo-Chinese negotiations, it was at the same time refusing to accede to similar demands made by Great Britain before the resumption of the Russo-British negotiations. On the

[1] Dr. C. C. Wu's speech at the Williamstown Conference, as reported in the *New York Times* of August 2, 1929.

one hand, the Soviet blames Great Britain for presenting such demands; on the other hand, the Soviet blames China for not acceding to such demands. This remark might appear sarcastic were it not too true.

A little delay in the appointment of one man as manager of a small single-track railway as the Chinese Eastern seems to be such a simple matter that any armed conflict over it would be making a mountain out of a molehill. But controversies over the fateful Chinese Eastern are often not so simple as they appear, for the whole conception and arrangement of that railway is full of complications, leading to endless tragedies unparalleled elsewhere. Being conceived in the dark chambers of the late Czar's palace and delivered behind closed doors by Li Hung-chang and Lobanoff, the Chinese Eastern has been breeding trouble ever since its incarnation. In name it is a commercial enterprise in reality it has been a political agent of Russian conquest, be it White or Red. It led to the Russo-Japanese War in 1903; it brought about the Soviet-Chinese conflict to-day.

The original Chinese Eastern contract of 1896 provided that the railway should be owned and managed by a private company whose stock may be acquired by Chinese or Russians; but the Czar saw to it that the stock certificates should be printed in St Petersburg, and that his Finance Minister should buy them up as they came out of the press. The contract says that the undivided surplus of the railway should be applied to the redemption of the line on China's behalf, but it is silent as to what should be the maximum dividend to be declared. Again, it says that China may redeem the railway upon paying both the cost of construction and the debts resulting from operation, but the Czar's agents were reported to have been encouraged to spend as much as possible on the railway so that it should become unattractive for China to redeem it. The Czar's agents seemed to have succeeded because the cost per mile of the Chinese Eastern to-day is just about five times that of the average Chinese Government railway. Thus the old Czar fooled Li Hung-chang from the beginning of the Chinese Eastern game.

The first appearance of the Soviet on the stage of the Chinese Eastern tragedy was by the famous Karakhan declaration of 1919, in the drawing up of which Lenin directly participated. By this solemn declaration the Soviet condemned the Chinese Eastern Railway as a symbol of imperialistic oppression of the Czarist *régime*, and made the grand gesture that it would be returned to the Chinese people without compensation. This gesture made a profound impression upon young China. In 1924 Karakhan came to Peking as the Soviet ambassador to settle the Chinese Eastern question. By that time, however, the Soviet found itself

no longer in a position to indulge in the generosity she seemed to show five years before. To a certain extent China was to blame for the Soviet's change of mind, because at the time of Karakhan's declaration China was so afraid of the Red *régime* that she did not dare to accept the Soviet's magnanimous offer then and there. So, after considerable bargaining, China and the Soviet signed two agreements whereby they gave the Chinese Eastern the naked status of a Government enterprise to be jointly owned and managed by the two countries on a half-and-half basis.

This new Sino-Soviet arrangement was put into operation in October 1924. At the time both China and the Soviet liberally blamed the Czarist *régime* for all the woes of the Chinese Eastern. Both let the world understand that they would do better. As a matter of fact, however, it seems that the new arrangement between Soviet Russia and republican China has been even less wholesome than the old arrangement between the Czar and the Son of Heaven, for it took the old arrangement eight years to bring on the Russo-Japanese War, while it took the new arrangement less than five years to lead to the present Russo-Chinese conflict.

The irony of fate is that, instead of simplifying matters, China and the Soviet added a few more complications to the numerous old ones bequeathed by the Czarist *régime*. First of all the new agreement says that, pending revision, the original contract and statutes of the Chinese Eastern Railway as approved by the Czarist Government in 1896, in so far as they do not conflict with the new agreements or prejudice the sovereign rights of China, shall continue to be effective. This provision refers to some voluminous and ambiguous documents which were framed in rather weird circumstances. It is extremely difficult, to say the least, to determine which clauses are prejudicial to China's sovereign rights and which provisions of the old documents conflict with the new agreement and which do not. This becomes especially complicated when the differentiation is left in the hands of the directors of the Chinese Eastern, who seem to have been quarrelling constantly among themselves. Thus by one stroke the ghost of the Czarist *régime* animated the body of the new agreement.

The new agreement provided for a board of directors to exercise control over the railway, which shall consist of ten members, of whom five shall be Chinese and five Russian, six votes being necessary to make a decision effective. But in practice it seems that the five Chinese directors usually vote one way, while the five Russian directors vote the other, so that most of the board meetings have ended in deadlock. This would not have been so bad had there been some adequate provision for breaking up such *impasses*. Nothing of the sort, for

the agreement seems to go from bad to worse when it stipulates that all disagreements, with the exception of estimate and budget matters, among the directors shall be referred to the two Governments for settlement. When all disagreements among the directors of the railway have to be settled by two Governments through diplomatic channels, how can the railway's business be prevented from degenerating into a political squabble?

The agreement further provides that the manager of the railway shall be a Russian, and that 'the rights and duties of the manager . . . shall be defined by the board of directors.' The first part of this provision was soon carried out when a Red manager replaced a White. But when it came to the second part the Russian directors wanted to enlarge the rights and duties of the manager, while the Chinese directors wanted to curtail them and neither side has as yet secured the necessary six votes to settle the issue. In the meantime the manager runs the railway as he pleases, claiming that all his actions are justified by one or other of the numerous statutes of 1896 which do not conflict with the 1924 agreement. As it requires six votes for the board of directors to curb him, all the trouble he faces is five adverse, but ineffective, Chinese votes. Since the Chinese directors seemed stupid enough not to have attached a time limit to the manager's appointment when that was voted on, they cannot get rid of him. This may explain why the Soviet is so insistent upon restoring the *status quo*.

By simply standing still and declining to vote the Soviet directors have beaten their Chinese colleagues from the beginning of the game. With this simple device they have completely nullified the functions of the board, and rendered that body—the highest and most responsible, according to the agreement—impotent, and 'managed to obtain the most important offices in the administration of the road, appropriated the revenues and otherwise neglected the treaty rights of the Chinese.' [3]

Quarrelsome and exasperated, the directors could do nothing but refer the disputes to their Governments for 'a just and amicable settlement.' At first the two Governments had to make some gesture towards *rapprochement*, but since the raid upon the Soviet embassy in 1927 they ceased to be on speaking terms. China endeavoured to ask for mediation; but that move itself would constitute a gross violation of the 1924 agreement, which specifically says that all questions arising out of the Chinese Eastern should be settled between China and the Soviet 'to the exclusion of any third party or parties.'

While recognising that China may have had some real grudge against the Soviet manager and directors, we cannot but feel that

[3] Editorial of *New York Times*, July 13, 1929.

the coup of July 10 was neither entirely wise nor altogether justified. It at once created the impression that seizure of the railway, instead of being a temporary measure to rectify an anomalous situation, was permanent. This impression became especially vivid, because it took place at a time when there was a widespread propaganda that China would unilaterally abolish extra-territoriality and all other foreign privileges. Both coming at the same time created the feeling that Nanking's foreign policy was returning to that of Hankow days, noted for getting what it could by force. Thus the *New York Evening Post* commented that the seizure of the Chinese Eastern signals a 'further step in the campaign for abolition of unequal treaties. . . . The Russian crisis is a glaring example of what may happen to any one of the Treaty Powers.'

Japan was especially unfavourably impressed. While she has no special love for the Soviet, the consideration of her own interests most naturally and rightly led her to feel some sympathy for the Soviet, since she also 'suffers under uncertainty of what will happen next. . . .'[3] This feeling is almost universally reflected by the Japanese Press. Indeed, the *Tokyo Asahi*[4] expressed this fear three weeks before the seizure of the railway took place, when it frankly said that the raid upon the Soviet consulate might indicate that China had 'covetous eyes fixed on the South Manchuria Railway.' To arouse the suspicion of Japan and to create a bad impression abroad was unfortunate, because possession of property by seizure is out of date, no matter what the cause.

But, unfortunately, it was not the Chinese Eastern Railway muddle alone that precipitated the coup. Another and far more mischievous factor is claimed to be the constant efforts of the Soviet railway agents to use their office for spreading Bolshevist propaganda. The Chinese Government has made public its findings, together with photographs of documents alleged to have been seized at that time. 'China must prevent such propaganda at all costs,' as Minister C. T. Wang declared, 'lest Communism should again play havoc.' This declaration well voices the feeling of the great majority of the thinking Chinese, and it is no exaggeration of China's fear of Communism, because the poisonous seeds planted by Comrade Borodin and his associates are by no means uprooted.

This claim of the Chinese is at once denied by the Soviet and its advocates, who label it as nothing but a disingenuous excuse on the part of China to get control of the railway. They curtly dismiss the evidence as forgery.

[3] Editorial of *New York Times*, July 13, 1929.
[4] May 20, 1929.

We are not in a position to prove the authenticity or otherwise of the evidence against the Soviet agents in Harbin, but those who were in China during 1926-7 know how deep an inroad Soviet propaganda has made upon a large section of young China. The fact that many middle-class families, including my own, felt constrained to dispose of their houses in Peking at reduced prices for fear of being ' sovietised ' only tells part of the story of the grave situation. My five years' association with the Russians lead me to think it well-nigh impossible for the Soviet agents on the Chinese Eastern not to indulge in political propaganda, even if they were not induced to do so by Moscow. Of all the people I know of, the Russians have the strongest characteristic of being political minded. For Russians to refrain from political propaganda after being baptised in Sovietism and sent forth from Moscow to the end of the Far East would seem impossible.

What China charges Russia's Communists with doing in Manchuria, the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Japan well know other Communists have attempted to do in their respective countries ; but these countries are hundreds or thousands of miles away, whereas Manchuria is embraced by the Soviet on two sides from without and honeycombed by thousands of Soviet agents from within.

The truth seems to be that it is both for the control of the Chinese Eastern and the prevention of propaganda that the drama of July 10 was staged. For China to deny the intention of getting more control of the railway is about as far off the mark as for the Soviet to claim its innocence of spreading Communistic propaganda.

On the other hand, it is quite evident that China did not intend to seize the railway permanently, even if she desired it. Private information shows that what China really wanted was a fair and square application of the 1924 agreement, which, as China thinks, entitles her to share equally with the Soviet in the ownership and management of the Chinese Eastern. Thus to get 50 per cent. control of the railway was half the cause, while Soviet propaganda furnished the other half that led to the explosion.

Another strange aspect of the Russo-Chinese drama is the conflict of personalities, who, like fragments in the great kaleidoscope of China, move to and fro forming ever unfamiliar designs with each turn of the instrument. It will be remembered that the 1924 agreements, while signed by Dr. V. K. W. Koo, were mostly negotiated by Dr. C. T. Wang, the then special commissioner to handle the Russo-Chinese questions with Comrade Karakhan, Soviet ambassador to Peking. When the agreements were initialled by Dr. Wang and M. Karakhan they were rejected

by the Peking Cabinet," with Dr. Koo as Foreign Minister. Thereupon Commissioner Wang resigned and Dr. Koo resumed negotiations with M. Karakhan. Final agreements were soon signed by the Foreign Minister, which differed little from those initialled by the retiring commissioner. What an irony of fate that to-day Wang, as the Nationalist Foreign Minister, should be accusing the Soviet of the violation of the agreements signed by his political rival, with Koo rumoured to be carrying on independent negotiations with Moscow from Mukden behind the back of Nanking, while Karakhan is again matching wits with both Koo and Wang in defending the Soviet's interests in the Chinese Eastern which he himself categorically renounced by his famous declaration of exactly ten years ago! Again, in the field of military operations, we find the same conflict of personalities. For at the head of the Red army confronting Manchuli is General Bluecher, who is no other than the famous General Galan, erstwhile right-hand man to President Chiang-Kai-shek in conquering South China.

The complexity of nationalities arising out of the Manchurian drama is unique. For example, there are about 100 'real' Americans in and around Harbin, in addition to which there are the 'near' Americans and *quasi*-Americans. These 'near' Americans are young Russians who have been sent to the United States for the purpose of obtaining an education and, incidentally, American citizenship. They turn up in Manchuria with their American 'papers' or certificates of citizenship and ask to be registered in the American consulate, which is perfectly right and proper. Then it often follows that the father (Russian) will turn over all his property to the naturalised son in order that a bright new American flag can be flown over the premises. The import of this is that the Russians, having lost their extra-territoriality right, are subject to Chinese law and Chinese taxes, while Americans still enjoying extra-territoriality rights are free of Chinese law and Chinese taxes, and hence the presence of an American flag over a business house, retail store, or a warehouse filled with valuable cargo has considerable monetary value in taxes saved. What is to be done with these 'near' Americans, 'near' Italians, 'near' English, 'near' French, and 'near' Irishmen?

The '*quasi*-Americans' is a name given to the Russian ladies who marry American husbands out there. In Harbin it is said there are four women to each man, with the usual consequence that the young Americans, far away from their home-town friends, take unto themselves Russian wives. Then the complexity in nationalities crops up, and it seems to keep on cropping up every time a child is born.

But most tragic is the conflict of political colour lines. When the Sino-Soviet management of the Chinese Eastern was inaugurated in 1924 most of the Russians on the railway were left over from the White *régime*. They were compelled to take out Soviet papers, and were then called 'Radishes,' as they were Red only on the outside and remained White inside. When the Red directors and managers were dismissed last July many of the 'Radishes' were also dismissed at the instigation of the Whites, who became the principal advisers of the Chinese. On the other side, the Soviet trade unions pressed them to resign, under threat of reprisals and loss of citizenship when the Soviet agents return to Manchuria. Many resigned, and have been suffering extreme hardship because it is impossible to find new employment.

The position of those remaining in the railway service is equally unenviable. The Soviet side considers them 'enemies of the people,' whereas the Chinese side cannot call them 100 per cent. Chinese. Should a Soviet-Chinese condominium be restored—which looks likely at the time of writing—such Russians would be the first to lose their positions at the instigation of the Bolsheviks. Thus all the Russians now on the railway find themselves between the devil and the deep sea.

What is worse is that the Red army is ordered to kill every White Russian on sight. This is no empty threat. Already Chinese and foreign sources gave support to the White Russian report lodged with the German consulate at Harbin that about 200 of their men, women, and children were slaughtered near Hailar during the recent invasion. As there is not any external mark to distinguish the Red Russians from the White, and as old grudges may easily lead some of the Red soldiers, many of whom have been in Manchuria before, to be somewhat colour-blind, the conflict among the Russians along the Chinese Eastern may yet reach a more acute stage when the Red manager and assistant managers return at the head of the Soviet triumph.

From an international point of view the conflict of ideas between the different nations is shown at its best in Manchuria. To begin with, China has always considered the dispute arising out of the Chinese Eastern as a matter to be settled by negotiation or mediation. The temporary discharge of some railway employees found guilty of political plots did not seem to her to involve any question of national honour calling for armed force. Therefore she has repeatedly proposed arbitration to the Soviet. The last proposal was submitted late in November through the German Government, in which China proposed that both sides should withdraw their troops thirty miles from the borders and that a Sino-Russian joint commission be formed, composed of equal

mission of Chinese and Russians, with a national of a neutral country as chairman, to investigate conditions.

We are not yet aware what is the Soviet's real attitude toward this proposal for arbitration or mediation, but all reports, including the Soviet's Tass Agency, repeatedly say that the Soviet considers all forms of mediation as 'wicked imperialistic plots of the capitalists.' China's direct and indirect requests for arbitration so far have made no favourable impression upon the Soviet.

This state of affairs did not prevent the friendly nations from taking a keen interest in minimising the conflict between China and the Soviet. Germany has been in the happy, although difficult, position of taking care of the Soviet's interests in China and China's interests in Russia, and has continually exerted her efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement. When the Russo-Chinese crisis developed last July, Secretary Stimson led the way in appealing to both China and the Soviet to remember their obligations under the Kellogg anti-war Pact, and received ready assurance from both countries of their adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of that Treaty. Following the recent Russian invasion, Stimson formally appealed to all the fifty-three signatory Powers of the Kellogg Treaty, including China and Russia, for mobilising world public opinion to check hostilities in Manchuria. In all these efforts London and Washington seemed to have worked hand in hand. France, Germany, Italy, and many other nations all responded readily to the American appeal.

The American Note contained nothing of egoism or motives that could possibly lend themselves to suspicion. It was simply a friendly reminder of the dangerous possibilities involved by the Manchurian crisis, which was becoming more threatening every day. The Soviet decidedly dislikes the American appeal, and considers it, in unmistakable terms, an act unfriendly to Russia. It emphasises the fact that it has not diplomatic relations with the United States—the same emphasis that it made when China endeavoured to negotiate with it early in July. The Soviet apparently insists upon settling the matter with Manchuria, a province of China, instead of settling it with China as a nation, an act which under normal conditions would itself bring on war; but conditions in China are not normal. The Soviet succeeded in making a separate agreement with Mukden in 1924, and succeeded again on December 22 last in concluding a protocol with the Mukden delegate at Khabarosk, which provides for the restoration of the *status quo* pending the conference to be held in Moscow on January 25, 1930, at which all outstanding questions were to be settled.

All through Tokyo has constantly been consulted. As the *New York Times* well observed, 'as the most interested spectator

on the Russo-Chinese quarrel in Manchuria, Japan has maintained an attitude at once restrained and diplomatically correct.' But behind that 'diplomatically correct' attitude, does not there appear something that is perplexing, if not causing anxiety? She consistently opposes all forms of mediation on the part of friendly Powers, but at the same time concentrates 10,000 troops in Changchun, with more to come by various routes. Japan officially states, as reported by the Associated Press on December 3, that she does not intend to issue a declaration supporting the American Note, or otherwise to associate herself with the proposal, because Tokyo fears that the Chinese might interpret such a declaration from Japan as an intervention in their behalf, stiffening the Chinese attitude and interfering with prospects of an early peace. But cannot Tokyo hear that what China wants is settlement by arbitration rather than by armed forces? And does Japan mean that China's attitude should not be allowed to stiffen sufficiently so as to permit arbitration? Arbitration may not be a perfect instrument for settling disputes, but it is certainly the most advanced method which civilisation has so far discovered. It is difficult to understand what Japan has in mind when she opposes steps toward settling the Russo-Chinese dispute by mediation or arbitration.

Whether it is advisable for China to appeal to the League of Nations or to resort to the Kellogg Pact has been an important question, not only from China's point of view, but from that of the League as well. While under the League Covenant the members may be called on to deal with aggression of a non-member against a member, yet the position appeared clearer under the Kellogg Pact, because Russia is a signatory of the Pact, but not a member of the League. Furthermore, it is apparent that some Powers, including China, would wish to consult the United States, which is considered as being more concerned with the violation of the Kellogg Pact than with that of the Covenant. Therefore, when the crisis in Manchuria became threatening, it was but natural that the appeal was made in the name of the Pact.

This appeal gave the Kellogg Pact a test at its weakest point. As Litvinoff pointed out, the Pact does not expressly give, either to the United States or any group of Powers, the right to act as guardians of the Pact and to call any other nation's attention to a violation of it, for the Pact provides no specific machinery for its application. According to the Pact, the high contracting parties merely declare that 'any signatory Power which shall hereafter seek to promote its national interests by resort to war should be denied the benefits furnished by the Treaty.' In other words, if we were to admit that Russia has sought to promote her national interests by invading Manchuria, she automatically

loses the protection of the Pact, and may herself be attacked by any signatory Power without violation of the agreement. But no nation is bound to launch such an attack at the request of China as a victim of aggression. Thus the Soviet might feel there is not much benefit to lose. It is believed in certain international circles that this defect of the Pact must be remedied.

In this respect it is claimed that the League Covenant is better, for it not only specifically gives any League member the right to call attention to any threat of war, but provides certain machinery for ending the threat. Article XVI. of the Covenant provides that if any member of the League shall go to war in disregard of its obligations, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League. That nation then becomes an aggressor and is subject to punishment as a law-breaker. So far so good; but it does not seem to go far enough, for it fails to say in what form, and by whom particularly, such punishment should be inflicted. So here, again, the advantage seems to be more apparent than real. Take the present Manchurian crisis, for instance; certainly not all the League members can deny that there was a threat of war, and yet no member observed the League Covenant by doing anything to prevent it. Even China's appeal to the League for action was itself postponed on the League officials' advice, if not request. Moreover, France, Great Britain, and others openly admitted the threat of war by joining the United States in its appeal concerning the Pact, and yet none of them (all important members of the League) took any action under the obligation of Article XI. of the Covenant, which says that 'any threat of war is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League of Nations.' When it comes to the final analysis it seems that the effect of the Covenant differs little from that of the Pact, for in either case the net result is that when it is everybody's business it is nobody's business.

Another difficult problem which confronts the League formula is to determine who is the aggressor. Take the present Russo-Chinese case. Is the Soviet the aggressor by reason of its invasion of Manchuria, or is China the aggressor for having deported the Soviet railway agents in contradiction of the 1924 agreement? Or again, is the Soviet the aggressor for having first violated that agreement by permitting those railway agents to stir up trouble in China? These and a hundred and one other similarly intricate questions must all be threshed out before punishment can be inflicted. The very fact that the League officials have from the beginning of the whole controversy shown an unmistakable dread of China's appeal to that body may indicate the difficulties involved.

But the question is not so much who is right and who is wrong; much less whether the Kellogg Pact or the League Covenant should take care of the case. What the world demands is (1) to stop fighting, and (2) to find some solution that will prove more or less lasting. Whatever remedy is applied, it must go to the very roots of the problem. The legitimate needs of Russia, be it White or Red, of a direct route to the sea, and the reasonable aspirations of the Chinese to free themselves of foreign interference in their domestic administration, must be taken into due consideration. The Sino-Soviet arrangement of 1924 set up such a nicety of control by both sides that its success depended wholly upon the most harmonious, the most intimate, and the most willing relations between the Chinese and the Soviet staff on the railway; and to maintain the arrangement of managing a railway by two Governments like that of China and Russia on a fifty-fifty basis is, without question, to continue an active cause of irritation between two nations.

With all the factors in view, it would seem that the only settlement that promises any reasonable degree of permanency is for China to redeem the Chinese Eastern in accordance with the agreement. For doing this the Shantung Railway settlement and the 'free transit' arrangements practised by the international railways in Europe would furnish practical precedents. After all, China and Russia must remember that, with a frontier of 5000 miles which cannot be protected with bayonets, they must give up the idea of playing for small gains and petty advantage. They must endeavour to be good neighbours. The only example to emulate is that between Canada and the United States, and the only way to settle disputes is by conference or arbitration. Failing in these, they fail in everything. They may stop fighting, they may patch up; but the falling of the curtain will not be the sign of the end, but of an intermission.

CHING-CHUN WANG.

THE FUTURE OF SEA POWER: A SPECULATION

DURING a discussion of the Naval Estimates in the House of Commons the First Lord of the Admiralty referred to the oft-repeated necessity of Britain standing ready to protect the imports of food whose temporary stoppage would mean certain starvation for her crowded millions. Lady Astor interposed a question. Who, she naïvely asked, threatened this admittedly vital trade, to which Mr. Bridgeman replied that he spoke of the protection of imports in time of war.

That is the sum and substance of the naval question. It is for war, and for war alone, that modern naval establishments exist.

Were war actually unthinkable, the high seas could be immediately disarmed except for the floating police which would always be needed to prevent the recurrence of piracy and to assure the safety of life and property in lands where local authorities are unable or unwilling to furnish the protection given by every civilised and sovereign State. Such a force might count many regiments of marines, their transport and their train with cruisers in support, but it need include no *Rodneys*, no *Marylands*, and no *Mitsus*. The very existence of battleships, despite the Pact of Paris, presupposes the possibility of war at sea on an extended scale. These great steel forts, the central bastions of naval power, were built to fight, if fight they must, in tremendous battles on vast and lonely seas. Not by their 16-inch salvos can distant trader and missionary be guarded, and long-suffering lands freed at last from the curse of Hatiian bandit, Chinese war lord, or Communist fanatic. Battleships are not the weapons of world order against world chaos, but of nation against nation. As such they were conceived and built by the masters of naval design. To speak of a nation's independent need of a navy or its abstract right to possess a naval force is to use phrases which are both vague and misleading. There is no other measure of the need of a navy than the likelihood of war (or the threat of war), the known strength of prospective enemies, and the magnitude of the issues involved for each nation in warfare at sea, nor is there any right to a navy save the inalienable right of self-defence.

Generalisations are always dangerous—never more so than in the sphere of naval and foreign policies. No two maritime nations are similarly placed. Britain, heart and centre of an Empire wrung from the sea through years of war, highly industrialised and immediately susceptible to attack, still fronts an armed Continent across the Narrow Seas. Old victories have bequeathed her a tradition, but not security. Prophetically Kipling wrote:

> We have fed our sea for a thousand years, and she calls to us, still unfed.

Japan, controlling the China Seas, facing no major base nearer than the still unfinished dockyard at Singapore, and that in the hands of a former ally, well realises the strength of her position. For France there are two separate coasts to guard and the sea lanes across the crowded Mediterranean to North Africa, whence in war cometh her hope. In a future conflict at sea who will be allies, who neutral? What sea areas will be controlled, what coasts blockaded? Who will question the blockade, and how? Are the League Covenant and the Pact of Paris destined to change the old conception of impartial neutrality, and will the neutrals of future wars be compelled by world opinion to allow the seas to be 'closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants'? The complications of world sea power are legion.

Yet one generalisation may surely be made. Until the day when all armaments are merged into an international police each nation will prepare its sea forces solely with an eye to the policies and purposes of war at sea which it thinks best in its own interest to seek. A ready naval defence may be the best, nay the only, assurance of peace, but it will be effective as such only if its readiness consist in direct preparation for war. Hence, whatever limits the statesmen proscribe, fleets still remain of their very nature competitive, each built for victory on the day of battle. Some lightly bunkered and bound to near-by bases are obviously designed as direct enemies; while others bear the stamp of all-round fighting forces of prospective use in many wars on widely separated oceans.

The weapons of sea power are the trident and net of the Roman gladiator, the trident of battle fleet striking force for victory at sea, the net of cruiser blockade and commerce control. With the trident the enemy is stricken down, with the net he is bound and strangled. The might of these weapons has been felt in all ages and on all seas. They have altered the course of world history, bringing to the victor wealth and empire.

Will sea power dominate the future as it has the past?

Let us review the teachings of naval historians in the light modern world conditions. At the outset we find that nava thought is largely influenced by the history of European expan sion in the centuries following the age of discovery. An almos unbroken series of British victories in the sea wars of this epoc gave to Admiral Mahan material on which to base his thesis sea power. To him the story of the past spoke clearly: 'Com merce abroad with strength at sea to support it is the mark of th greatness of an empire.' It is but a step to advance these idea to the claim that the present and the future course of trade an empire will be determined by the same forces, and that sea pow will ever remain the ruling factor in national prosperity an national greatness in time of peace as well as in time of war.

Is the supposition entirely justified? Does it not confuse th question of modern world trade, which is inherently peacefu and productive, with the question of war, which is inherent violent and destructive? Does history always repeat itself, an are the political and economic forces which characterised the pas likely to exert the same influence on the future?

The period of history comprising roughly the years betwee 1500 and 1900 saw a world-wide expansion of European civilisatio in terms of commerce, political control, and colonisation. witnessed the settlement of unknown continents by men European stock, the partition of Africa, and the partial conques of the Orient. Through much of its course ran a series of war for control of the sea, and for the right to have and to hold th great empty spaces in the sun. Up and down the oceans of th world the maritime nations fought for the exclusive right t exploit the new West and the ancient East, to tap the untouche wealth of India and Peru, to follow the fur trade through th trackless northern forests, to reap the quick profits of slave labo applied to virgin soil, and, in doing so, to lay the foundations future empire. A seventeenth century Europe, beating back th Turk under the very gates of Vienna, turned to the open sea For years the flag of empire followed the explorer's track—nort through the ice, south to the tropics, and east to the Indie In truth, Europe had found her future on the water.

Out of the welter of sea wars, lasting more than two centurie Great Britain seemed about to emerge the unrivalled victo When Wolfe lay dying in Quebec England held what might hav become world control. Scarcely more than twenty years late in the mud and cold at Yorktown, she lost an empire that bi fair to surpass in extent, and surely would have matched in wealt the greatness of imperial Rome.

The treaty signed at Paris in 1783 marks the end of an epoc Gone for ever was the vision of British world power. The ol

political conception of immediate imperial control and the parallel merchantilist theory of the economically self-sufficient empire had passed into the stuff of forgotten dreams. They were challenged at Lexington. They surrendered at Yorktown. During the six long years of the American Revolution obscure forces had been at work in the English mill towns, where machinery was being applied to manufacturing, ushering in the Industrial Revolution and the modern era of mass production. A new age gave birth to a new economic philosophy. The year of the Declaration of Independence had seen the publication of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, teaching that national wealth is not dependent on exclusive empire and exclusive commerce, but solely on the quickening of world trade in its natural channels, each nation, for its own benefit, and for the benefit of all, exchanging what it can best produce for what can best be produced abroad.

At Yorktown only the 'showy trappings of empire' had been lost. The future depended, not on the worn-out economic bond of colony and mother country, not on artificial trade restrictions—'that mouldy straw of the eighteenth century'—but on a new untrammelled commerce that should promise to all men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. So, in substance, wrote Adam Smith, and his ideas, echoed in France by statesmen who saw her first colonies fall like ripened fruit from the parent tree, were to be acclaimed as the new gospel. The ancient empires, founded on the explorations of intrepid seamen, were passing. The modern dominions of trade and industry were yet to be.

It was in terms of the political economy of Adam Smith that the great Liberal statesmen interpreted the prosperity of England in the nineteenth century. They saw in free trade the source of that unprecedented national wealth, which rested precariously on peace, an established empire, a head start in manufacturing at home and in selling abroad, and a carrying trade in iron ships stimulated by ever-increasing imports of food and raw materials and ready outbound cargoes of British coal.

To the men of Gladstone's time all these advantages seemed rooted in the very nature of things. They should be from everlasting even unto everlasting. The way had been made straight for Liberalism and permanent prosperity. The thought of war recalled the glories, but not the dire perils, of Trafalgar and Waterloo. Security at home and easy victories in border warfare from Nigeria to Tibet led Disraeli to boast, 'We have no reason to fear war. Her Majesty has fleets and armies which are second to none.'

And yet it was to prove a fragile structure, the economic pre-eminence of Victorian England. Despite a navy that could

'nourish trade in the teeth of war,' despite victory and the Carthaginian peace, secure prosperity vanished in 1919. Like mediæval Venice, it was builded from the sea. It was defended by victorious sea power. And yet it crumbled and fell in the tempest of four fierce years of war.

What of the future? Will wealth at sea follow the trident as of old, and the argosies of modern trade return as richly freighted as the *Golden Hind* and the proud East India fleets? Will future economic concessions, won by strength at sea, replace the mines of looted Mexico and all the burnt-out Caribbean empire, once so rich a prize that the island of Guadaloupe was bartered for the whole of Canada? Or have times changed, and is national wealth to-day intangible and illusive—following economic laws, no longer subject to the victors' guns?

It seems that any study of world conditions to-day shows them to be totally different from those which faced the impoverished Europe that looked out on the New World. We live in an age that in contrast is crowded, busy, and prosaic. There are no more empty continents to conquer and settle, no more ancient empires to pillage, not even a chance to take up a fuller measure of the 'white man's burden.' There no longer exists to any appreciable extent that type of commerce whose fabulous profits led gentlemen adventurers to Virginia, Hudson Bay, and the West Indies, where a gracious monarch left them free to fight their way to fortune and all unknowingly to carry with them the seeds of colonisation, of stable trade, and of an empire worth defending. To-day international trade is only to a minor extent a question of privilege and monopoly. For the most part it is the exchange of exportable surpluses between all nations, an exchange balanced by the flow of credit and specie. In order to sell abroad, a nation must buy abroad, sale, purchase, and transportation being made at competitive world prices. Beneath the tariffs and subsidies, through which nations seek special temporary advantage, irresistible economic laws are silently at work fashioning the varied tapestry of world commerce.

What influence has sea power (other than as anti-pirate police) on the whole vast pattern of international trade? In so far as the balance of competing navies assures world peace, it assures world prosperity, for with the fine atonement of modern trade they have become well-nigh synonymous. Distant battle fleets still mount guard over the trade of the Orient, lest one national appropriate to itself the sole right to buy cheap, sell dear, and lend at high interest in the unsettled markets of the Far East. The policy of the 'open door' rests to-day on a solemn treaty backed by the fleets at target practice off Chatham and San Pedro.

But, beyond the promise of world peace and of the right to

trade freely in the few remaining areas of chronic disturbance, naval power, including all the attendant factors of war readiness, serves only to disturb and distract the natural flow of world commerce; that complicated exchange and cross exchange between many peoples of the products of mine and factory, of prairie and jungle, made in order that mankind may have the material things of life and have them more abundantly. His would be a mean spirit indeed who did not hold that the defence of nations is worth more than the wealth of nations; but defence can be had only at a price, the price of preparation for war. Of necessity, nations regard the subject of trade in terms of war readiness, striving still for the ideal, though unobtainable, self-sufficient empire—dream of the eighteenth century merchantilists. As an element of preparedness at sea shipping and certain domestic products are artificially strengthened and protected in time of peace as future war assets. War and business are two quite different elements of human life, and yet they are inseparably joined. More than the questionable maintenance of protected wages, with its twin brother protected prices, industrial strength for war is the basis of the whole protective system. Bearing in mind the possibility of war, one must approach the question of international commerce from a very different point of view than the attractive *laissez-faire* of the economists.

To depend entirely on foreign bottoms, even in years of peace, is to give our export trade a hostage to alien shipping. In time of war, even though we be neutral, sufficient cargo space may be unobtainable at any price. And were we to be involved as a belligerent, it is to our own merchant marine that we must look, not only for the movement of the foreign trade on which so much of our industrial prosperity depends, but even more for the import of foreign materials without which our military forces would soon be powerless.

It is well, then, to stimulate in peace those domestic products needed for war and thus reduce the dangerous list of vital imports, whose defence must be the navy's first duty. And yet this is but one phase of the larger naval problem of guarding all seaborne commerce, which itself merges into the broad strategic scheme for the use of the nation's entire naval force to win victory at sea.

Any consideration of naval affairs leads inevitably to the conclusion that a navy, and all that relates thereto, is understandable only in terms of war. Protection of commerce is wholly a war question. It lies dormant in time of peace, when Lloyd's makes no reduction in insurance to British and American shipping despite its guard of *Kents* and *Pensicolas*, and the natural forces of world supply and demand bring the products of Belgian mills to

compete freely with those of Lowell and Birmingham for a return exchange of coffee in the markets of Brazil.

War changes all this. Economic laws no longer determine the course of trade. The ocean routes are watched by cruisers. Commerce is halted and questioned. It proceeds at peril. All nations are involved, as neutrals or belligerents, and if as belligerents, either in the *rôle* of blockader or blockaded, as nations without whose sanction no merchant ship may sail the seas, or as nations to whom the use of the sea is denied. Whatever country insist that its ships and its exports pass unhindered to destinations forbidden by the sea-controlling belligerent must stand prepared to enforce its interpretation of neutral rights by threat of war. A veiled threat involving no more than the possession of a ready navy of known strength may serve; but it is none the less a threat, heeded only if backed by a recognised force. In seeking to shield its sea-borne commerce a neutral must always face a determination on the part of the sea-controlling belligerent to forbid all trading with its enemy, under the perfectly sound assumption that all imports minister to the opposing army, and to press the theory of ultimate enemy destination to its logical conclusion in rationing all areas through which supplies may reach the hostile country. When Grotius wrote *De Jure Belli et Pacis* an army was an army. The forces of modern life have made it a nation. To-day, when the military supply table includes almost everything except cosmetics, it seems likely that only threat of intervention will preserve the last vestiges of the old distinction between contraband and non-contraband.

Nor is the most sweeping and stringent application of distant blockade the only war-time barrier to neutral trade. Counter-blockade by commerce destruction may prove an even more dangerous hinderance. Despite the Washington Treaty, it is not unlikely that a nation struggling for its very life against the slow strangulation of blockade will use every weapon in retaliation, including the submarine. The danger is very real. The sinkings of the last war speak for themselves. And since then improved under-water craft and air force have given so sharp a sword to commerce destruction that certain British writers see the future safety of their country, not in the squadrons that still bear the proud names of 'those sea-worn ships on which the Grand Army never looked,' but in the acceptance by all nations of the most extreme theory of neutral rights. After centuries of victory they would surrender the hard-won control of the sea where 'never a wave of all her waves but marks the English dead' for a treaty promising freedom from the menace of counter-blockade.

In a future struggle of any magnitude unguarded neutral commerce seems destined to meet a situation as intolerable as

that which led Secretary of State James Monroe to long for war against both England and France, muttering a curse on both their houses. From captured palaces the emperor whose victorious armies swept the Continent, and whose commerce destroyers could still slip out through the British blockading squadrons, issued decrees against neutral shipping. Britain retaliated by Orders in Council and a widening of the blockade. The press gang could no longer drag aboard enough drunken wretches to fill the ships, floating hells of cruel discipline, whose weary months and years at sea were broken only by an occasional debauch at anchor in home ports, when contrary gales blew them off station, and ended only by the stark horror of battle under an immortal admiral who flew the signal 'Engage the enemy closer.' For years sea power was taxed to its limit. Merchant seamen were pressed from the decks of Yankee ships to man short-handed cruisers, whose captains had a keener appreciation for 'handy topmen' than for newly established American citizenship. But the protests of a weak republic overseas went unnoticed while two great coalitions met in a death struggle with the future of Europe in the balance. In 1812, goaded to desperation, we joined the war, with little influence on its outcome.

Again in 1917 our protests were unheeded. Germany played for the highest of all stakes, victory in a war that already counted the dead by millions, but her admirals and statesmen misjudged, if only narrowly, the strength of the United States navy. To-day, with a navy equal to the most powerful, we may rest assured that our neutral rights will not again be challenged, and that our fleet, if ready for war, will stand as a world force forbidding a repetition of the excesses of blockade and counter-blockade.

But it is not impossible that the threat of war may lead to war itself, and the position shift from that of a neutral shielding neutral trade to that of a belligerent whose commerce can be guarded only by active naval operations against the enemy. A belligerent unable to win control of the sea by battle or threat of battle must watch its shipping rust unused in harbour. To a nation defeated at sea the paths of world trade are closed. The blue water is no longer a shield. It has become a broad highway for enemy attack. A purely maritime nation must fight or perish. A land power, denied access to the high seas, may still fight on, against time and the slow suffocation of blockade, and, like a gladiator menaced by the trident and struggling to free himself from the imprisoning net, strike out fiercely with the sword. In past wars the net and trident of sea power have triumphed over the sword, but by how slight a margin and at what tremendous cost naval historians seem scarcely to realise. Never in modern war has even the most powerful fleet been able

to win and keep actual unbroken control of the sea in the face of a determined adversary. The depredations of the *Alabama* and consorts, the far-flung squadrons despite which a few German cruisers spread terror over the seven seas in the early months of the last war, and the dark menace of the submarine blockade—known only at Whitehall, where sore, burdened man faced defeat—there among the trophies of old victories: these are but indications of the overwhelming forces necessary to assure world-wide control, though no enemy battle fleet actively dispute it.

Nor is the establishment and maintenance of sea control the final purpose of naval warfare. It is not enough that an unopposed fleet can protect trade in the face of war. Something more will be demanded by the nation, seeking vaguely, but with sound intuition, the still further use of its navy in violent combat against the enemy. No great war has been won by naval operations alone, much less by commerce control and commerce protection. Though Gallipoli was a tragic failure, there was something eternally right in the ideal which inspired that most ill-fated and daring of ventures—the belief that the safety of Allied commerce, the control of neutral commerce, and the closing of the seas to German commerce was not enough; that somewhere, somehow, the fierce destruction of triumphant guns must play its deadly part. And the same ideal animated German naval leaders. It was not enough that the ready High Seas Fleet should control the Baltic, forbid close blockade, and hold bound to its North Sea bases an overwhelming counter-force. Somehow German ships must offer battle. In the early days of the war, before there crept in the deadening philosophy of the world siege at sea, battle was held by some to be an object to be sought for itself, sea control as a benefit attendant on victory. Fighting seemed fundamentally good for its own sake; for war is essentially destructive, a turn of thought based on the sheer glorification of combat, which is the one constant in the genius of all great soldiers.

What His Majesty's commander-in-chief, Sir George Rodney, Admiral of the White, himself controlling the seas, wrote from New York in sneering criticism of British inaction in the American Revolution is true of all wars: 'Believe me, my lord, in this war, the sword must cut and cut deep.' Napoleon complained that French admirals 'were always talking of pelagic conditions and ulterior motives, as if there could be any motive in war except to get in contact with the enemy and destroy him'; and Paul Jones saw in the manœuvres by which Degrasse denied the Chesapeake to the British relieving squadrons and compelled the surrender of Cornwallis only the lost opportunity 'to sink the enemy's ships and kill his seamen.'

Had I stood in the shoes of Degrasse, [he boasted; and the memory

of the *Bonhomme Richard's* bloody decks justified the boast] there would have been disaster for someone off the Capes of the Chesapeake; disaster of more lasting significance than the orderly retreat of a beaten fleet to a safe port. . . . To me war is the sternest and gloomiest of all human realities, and battle the cruellest and most forbidding of human practices. . . . It is the true duty of everyone concerned to make them the most destructive . . . that the real cause of humanity may be gained by making them the soonest ended. . . .

It would be impossible to find a truer and more complete philosophy of war—war whose essence is violence and the unsheathed sword.

He who would seek the idea behind those majestic ships home from winter manœuvres, resting at the battleship buoys under the bustle and wealth of New York's Riverside Drive, is led step by step from the hope that their sole purpose is peacefully to guard the national wealth of which the busy drive is itself a symbol, to the realisation that their protection springs from their power to make war, that these ships are not a shield, but a sword, and that war means far more than the mere protection of wealth and the commerce at sea from which it springs.

For the naval officer there can be no other philosophy. He has but to glance at the wardroom copy of *Fighting Ships* to know that in foreign ports ride other fleets ready and waiting. As long as the faintest shadow of war menaces the country he serves he must labour unceasingly that her flag may fly from the gaff of newer and yet more powerful ships—ships that give promise of peace in a world still heavily armed, and, failing peace, of victory won long before the scholar need be taken from his books and the artist from his studio to swell the ranks in the great citizen armies of protracted wars. If the nations be not masters of their fate, and the vision of perpetual peace prove but an empty dream—if, in truth, *la politique, c'est la destinée*—then ready armaments will best serve mankind if, in promising quick decision, they assure that only those who live by the sword need die by the sword.

And yet the real cause of humanity rests, not on war, with its stern and inexorable philosophy of destruction, but on the high purpose of earnest men and women who seek gradually to remove in all countries its menace and its symbol, that other generations be not called to follow those gone before.

> Who died obscurely most in foreign lands,
> For some ideal but dimly understood . . .

In their search for peace we wish them well, realising that those of us who may yet be summoned 'to take up arms in public war have not thereby ceased to be human beings,' nor ceased to share their high hope for years to come.

MELVIN F. TALBOT.

CANADA'S OUTLOOK

In a recent conversation a Canadian said to the writer: 'You know, even despite my long residence in England, I can never feel that this is my home; nor can I get used to your class divisions.' He had led an academic career of distinction in this country; he knew and loved England, but it was not his own country. He was of a different people.

It is equally true that comparatively few English people who go to live in Canada, unless they do it while young, are able to feel good Canadians: they talk to the last of England as home. But their children born in the country are Canadians; and consequently there is evident a separation between parents and children greater than the normal. The English parents and their Canadian children fail to understand one another's points of view.

The gap as between two nations is of recent growth. Perhaps the war, more than anything else, signified to the world and to herself that Canada had attained her majority. England, like most parents, has not fully realised it. It is still possible to hear Canada talked of as a 'colony.' In official documents the Englishman describes the Empire as the British Commonwealth of Nations, but he is not usually prepared for the independence and difference in outlook which is implied in that phrase.

To see if it is really a Canadian nation it is necessary to realise a little of the history and geography of the country and to comprehend the diversities of race which have settled there, and, arising out of these two things, the sort of general ideas current in Canada, and different from our own.

The approach to Canada is unique. It is no mere landing at a port which hove into view an hour or two before. The ship has sailed for about a week across the Atlantic, and has entered Canadian waters either south of Newfoundland or by the narrow Belleisle strait, between the desolate coast of Labrador and the woody but dull north shore of Newfoundland. From that strait it will steam two days and nights up the gulf and river of the St. Lawrence. Often there is no sight of land, so that it does not seem strange that the earliest explorers thought that here they

had discovered the North-West Passage. This sailing in a 20,000-ton ship between the banks of a river for hour after hour, even though the banks are at first miles apart, is a suitable preparation for the newcomer's reception of Canada. Somehow, after sailing for two evenings into the sunset, it no longer seems so fanciful as before to imagine with many Americans that the course of civilisation is that of the sun, and that in this new land it is completing its course. Be that as it may, the St. Lawrence stands in three respects as a symbol for all Canada. It is vast as Canada is vast. Secondly, it is a narrow strip of water upon whose banks there is stretched out village after village and continuous line of farms to which the river is like a great high-road; just so is inhabited Canada, a narrow strip of country 100 to 200 miles broad, stretching for more than 2500 miles east and west. And, thirdly, the St. Lawrence freezes in winter. It is difficult to imagine it as the ship steams up against the current, but so it is. And likewise does Canada freeze up in winter, gaining thereby one of its greatest assets. Owing to climate, there can never be too great an amount of luxurious ease, and always will man remain in that strong competition with Nature which underlies progress. The people of the country must always be of a strong and vigorous type. There is little likelihood of a negro question arising; neither is Canada going to be overrun by southern Europeans. The probability is that the people of Canada will not add to their other diversities that of a mixture of all the nations of Europe.

The population of this long, narrow strip is now about 9,000,000, and great have been the achievements of such small numbers. The most eastern 1000 miles were once covered by forests. None but a pioneer could tell of the difficulties that faced all those who had to cut their farms out of the woods. It required years of perseverance and patience. Still, to-day one occasionally meets with fields whose fences are the upturned roots of trees, the sight of which reminds one how much went to the clearing of a single field. Or one may read the French Canadian novel *Maria Chapdelaine* and get some glimpse of the labour of pioneering. Thus the small farms, with their solid-looking houses and barns dotting the countryside of Ontario, are witness to no inconsiderable achievement. The first settlers of Ontario arrived less than a century and a half ago, and for long remained only a few thousand, so that most of this eastern forestland has not been opened up for more than three generations.

But it is hard to select examples that will adequately express the character of the work that has been done by so few men in so short a time. The structure of an up-to-date civilised community has been built across the continent. There is the story

of the act of faith that impelled a population of 4,000,000 to erect a railway across 2000 miles of country, including two ranges of mountains—one of which, in the words of Whymper, is 'sixty Switzerlands rolled into one'—to reach a little community of 50,000 in British Columbia. It took thousands of men nearly ten years to complete, and several times it was 'touch and go' whether they could succeed. They did succeed, and during the last fifty years the Dominion of Canada has been formed along these rails.

Geographical conditions have been directly opposed to the building of a nation across a narrow strip of country of such a length. The natural line of development is north and south. Beyond the St. Lawrence there is very little reason why one foot of territory should be Canadian and another a part of the United States. Each section of Canada belongs by nature to the American State just south of it; it is easier to go from New Brunswick into Maine than into Quebec, and so on throughout the borderland. The pull of industry is undoubtedly north and south. Here, then, is a clear case of man controlling geography, of setting himself against the natural order of things and sticking to it, so that by now he has succeeded in making of this country one nation. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of this task whereby a people, throwing off paternal government, has cleared half a continent, constructed the machinery of provincial and federal government, and made an entity of the most diverse elements.

For it must always be remembered that Canada is made up of powerful diversities; indeed, so strong are these that they seem sometimes to endanger the unity of the country. Disruption is still a factor that has to be reckoned with. There still might—it is unlikely, but there is the bare possibility—be a dangerous movement of one part or other for secession. During late years there has been a certain amount of irresponsible secession talk in the Maritime Provinces, and also in the Prairie Provinces. Neither is this to be wondered at, when one considers the origins of the various parts.

Quebec has a distinct and peculiar character of its own. On that voyage up the St. Lawrence, after nearly two days' steaming, the ship will bend with the river, and on the north bank in the distance is seen the city of Quebec. It is an old-fashioned city, with many churches and houses built one higher than the other on the side of the hill that rises to the plains of Abraham. Here in 1608 Champlain landed and started a fur-trading port. It seems strange to be landing in the New World at a city over 300 years old, but stranger still when one finds out the character of the city and province of Quebec. Here is a society older than

any in Western Europe. For 250 years changes have been small. The 3,000,000 inhabitants of the province are mainly the descendants of emigrants from France who left before [illegible]. Since then there has been hardly any colonisation, and one walks in a tradition and atmosphere not dissimilar to that of the time of Louis XIV. These people have settled here, prospered and increased in numbers. They are contented, unambitious, unenterprising. They are not worried by doubts or progress; they have been saved from the unhappiness of having to think for themselves. They have found the Iroquois and Nature a sufficient foe to tackle. Over them the seigneur and the priest, and now the priest alone, have exercised intellectual dominion. Nowhere, I suppose, in the Christian world is the power of the priest so unchallenged. The Roman Catholic Church in Quebec has taken, like the Grand Inquisitor in the Brothers Karamazov, the freedom and unhappiness of the people upon itself. Education is carefully regulated. Not in religion only, but in politics, the priest retains the leadership; the village priest is the most important politician in Quebec, and without his approval no statesman and no programme stands a chance.

Here is an important element in the make-up of Canada. Nearly a third of the total population are French Catholics, a strange, aloof people who have no use for the gods of progress and organisation. These Quebec habitants have strange ways about them. In politics they call themselves Liberal, but that is only because they called themselves by that name a long time ago and are too conservative to change. In religion an unbending conservatism prevails. Of late the priests have begun to view with suspicion a small amount of emigration of younger sons to the New England States, where they learn new ideas, and sometimes return home with them. The priests are beginning, therefore, to demand higher barriers against American trade, in order that work may be kept at home.

Determined to resist the modern materialistic spirit which they identify with their American neighbours, this community of Catholic peasants is equally opposed to further absorption by the other parts of Canada. Quebec is jealous of its privileges. It stands firm by the British North America Act—the charter by which Canada in 1871 became a federation, and by which Quebec retains a privileged position in the federation. The province has fears for its own position, which is that of a minority among English-speaking Protestants. It will not suffer itself to be eclipsed, and clings to the British North America Act and to the appeal to the Privy Council. Thus one has the curious spectacle of a French community setting the highest value on its connexion with the Imperial Crown, and it has been said that

the last ditch of the defenders of the British connection will be manned by French Canadians.

Here, then, in Quebec Canada possesses what could be a weakness, but what is probably an element of diversity of the highest value for its future welfare. The little white farms along the St. Lawrence, though one hears scanty news of them, add variety and dignity to the life of the nation.

There are in Canada at least four other sections, different in origin and outlook. British Columbia, settled largely by Englishmen and possessing a mild climate with great lumber and fruit-growing industries, contrasts strongly with the Prairie Provinces, that have been going only for twenty or thirty years, and support mainly an agricultural population drawn from Northern Europe and from the United States. Then there is Ontario, the industrialised, perhaps over-much industrialised, part of Canada, founded 150 years ago by the courage and endurance of the United Empire loyalists who left the United States in their thousands after the War of American Independence. The population of Ontario is English and Scotch, rather narrowly Protestant in outlook, but a shrewd, progressive community drawing now from the United States many of its ideas and much of its capital. Easternmost are the Maritime Provinces, a shipping, lumbering and fishing community, by nature much more allied to the New England States, and only with much loss and pain clinging to the rest of Canada. The greater part of its population is descended from the other wing of United Empire loyalists and from highlanders. These two provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, would profit greatly if they could become merged in the United States and could break down the tariff walls that prevent their natural development.

Western-moving progress has passed these provinces. They have been left behind by the newer, richer lands, and their natural outlet to the south has been blocked. They often feel aggrieved at the orientation east and west which they must obey in the interest of Canada. Secession talk is no new thing here, and perhaps it must not be taken too seriously, but the problem of the Maritime Provinces is one of the most enduring and difficult questions that Canadian statesmanship has to face.

If Canada sometimes proclaims and attests its nationhood more aggressively than seems necessary, the reason is this underlying diversity, which makes the people sensitive. To understand the country it is necessary to appreciate the force of this sectionalism, while remembering that, in spite of it, Canada is a nation—a nation the more highly coloured in expression because of certain natural weaknesses.

In the task of nation-building Canadian democracy has done

well. But there are other victories. While the efforts of England have been given to the development of political institutions, to the fostering of a highly developed life on a narrow front, American democracy is rendering its service by raising the standard of life of the whole people. Although there are bad patches, more particularly among European-born immigrants, the conditions of living are much better in America than anywhere else at any period in history. An easy indifference about wealth is a little unnatural, a trifle put on. There is a crime of poverty, of that starved, ungenerous sort of existence, that is soon translatable into terms of spiritual loss. There has to be an end to the poverty that blinds men from taking pride in themselves. Equality of wealth is not a matter of importance; the elimination of poverty is. It is often enough for the average Englishman, when told of America, to mutter something about materialism, and to return into himself comfortable and self-flattered.

Canadian and American democracy has not bothered its head about the tremendous trivialities that have so often disturbed the peace of Europe: it has been concerned with the raising of the standard of life—with questionings about smoke-free towns rather than frontier posts. In their care for the sick, in the purification and provision of milk, in the cleanliness of food, they are a long way ahead of us. What does this mean for the future of man? So much misery and failure is due to preventable poverty and disease; who can draw a fine distinction between what is material and what is spiritual? The Canadians and Americans have set out to improve the average; they spend great efforts and money upon it, and we ought to be just in our appreciation of this side of their life. After all, it goes for something when a nation can prove that a smokeless city is possible, or that high wages pay. It is a contribution to life of some value; and when millionaires give for education, for art, for medical research, millions of dollars so that an Englishman grows green with envy, you have something which means much, both of good and evil, in the story of the race.

And arising out of this average 'levelling-up' there are not the same class distinctions in Canada as in England. In Napoleon's army each soldier was said to carry a marshal's baton in his knapsack; in America each man assumes that he is capable of sitting in the director's chair, and is quite likely to do so some day. Even if that turns out to be a little optimistic, he never allows anyone to forget that one man is as good as another. It will not be difficult to remember instances of this kind of equalitarianism among the Canadian soldiers in the war. Titles (even though it be said *sotto voce* there is no greater admirer of titles than the Canadian) are officially frowned upon. The motor car a

few years ago might have been a mark of class distinction, but it is not the least of the services which Ford has rendered to America that his car prevented a social cleavage. A Packard and a Ford might be different things to look at, but the owner of the Ford would not consider his machine any the less a motor.

In regard to equality and class distinctions English ideas are different. Out there the 'man in the street' has received a great glorification, and there are disadvantages about this. Anything which deviates from type is likely to be ruthlessly eliminated. This remark is less true of Canada than of the United States; but, generally speaking, liberty is less safe on the American continent than it is in England—individuality is more inclined to be forced into a mould.

Average opinion has become so vociferous, so powerful, that anything unorthodox stands a poor chance. Not in law courts, nor in dismissals from position, but in the events of every-day life, does this tyranny take most effect—the hour-to-hour oppression of an outspoken public opinion, that browbeats every digression from type. It was just this danger that was foreseen 150 years ago in America by De Tocqueville, and fifty years ago in England by J. S. Mill. Armed, as never before, by a certain standard of education, and having at hand a ready slave and master in the Press, average opinion, pluming itself on an unreal equality, is ready to do battle with all that is strange to it.

There is a type of mind which wants to find in history some one controlling factor. The followers of Karl Marx discoursed on an economic interpretation of history, thinkers like Figgis substituted a religious interpretation, and more lately men have found an explanation of all historical events in geographical control. There is a good deal in this; certainly 3000 miles of ocean and different climatic conditions are responsible for a good deal of the difference between Canada and England. Time moulds separate nations under different conditions. Despite the connexion in our blood and English institutions on a new soil, the people of Canada are bound to develop an individuality of their own. It is entirely desirable that they should. So far as Canada, Australia, and the other Dominions are concerned, the British Empire is dead, and the British Commonwealth of Nations lives in its place; and it would lead to happier relations between the members of the Commonwealth if we made the assumption that the Dominions have already attained their majority and are developing separate and distinct nationhoods.

Geography is a strong controlling factor, but not the only one. As Canada made herself one despite all the pulls of geographical conditions, so common sentiment, similar institutions

affection, loyalty to the same Crown, bind the ocean and keep our two peoples together. The British Commonwealth of Nations is a reality, made stronger by a frank recognition that we are different.

The ideal British Commonwealth may not survive; it depends upon our efforts to understand the new world. Canada's real contribution to the society of nations is in its interpretation of England to the United States and of the United States to England. It alone can understand both. Canada has mainly English institutions and a political system like ours, while at the same time she is daily mixing with American ideas. By sentiment and sympathy she is attached to England, but she is more akin to her big neighbour in current ideas and outlook. She knows both of the main branches of the English-speaking world, and yet she is distinct from both. She is as much a separate people from ourselves as she is likely to remain separate from the United States. She has an individuality distinct from both, and is not likely to be swamped by either.

There are other things in which England and Canada are different. One might, for instance, mention that there is much less home life in Canada, and that there is a different quality of faith about the future. Most of us believe in the future of our own country, but in a new country like Canada the faith is intense. Men always seem to be thinking of the future, and it lends a tremendous power and directness to their work. You could as soon convince the chrysalis that it had no future as persuade a Canadian to leave off ruminating about the immensity of the promise of his country—that not long distant time when it will have more inhabitants than England, and will be making use of its vast riches, hardly yet scraped. In estimating the difference in outlook between the Englishman and the Canadian you are bound to take into consideration a different orientation of mind. They are always making plans and devising new schemes. An Englishman is proud of his history, a Canadian of his future.

Geoffrey F. Bell.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

In the whole of the Union of South Africa there are between 170,000 and 180,000 Indians, about 155,000 of whom are living in Natal. What is still known as the Indian problem is therefore most acute in the 'Garden Province.' Since the visit of the South African Indian Congress deputation to India in 1925 and the conferences of the official Indian delegations with the Union Government in 1926 and 1927, the position of Indians in South Africa has undoubtedly improved. Then the Europeans here seemed bent on forcing every Indian out of the country, an attitude that to-day, fortunately, has almost disappeared.

It was argued that Indians were multiplying so rapidly that they threatened to swamp the white races. To avoid such danger the need for better repatriation schemes and restriction of Indian immigration was essential. Indians were looked down upon by race-conscious whites and regarded with envy and jealousy by other races. But many Indians held fairly high positions in local society. Many had seats on the city councils and a few were members of the provincial councils. In Durban, with an Asiatic population of over 50,000, whole blocks of buildings were owned by Indians, who lived in the select parts of the town, and maintained expensive motor cars, sometimes driven by white chauffeurs. They had societies and associations, and, although inclined to confine interests to their own people, would gladly accept invitations to circles once the strict preserve of the white man.

Many of the Indians in South Africa to-day are descended from the few thousands brought over many years ago to labour in the Natal sugar plantations, where the natives were too indolent for the work. Many have now adopted the ideals of Western civilisation, and a number, without being compelled to do so, have been converted to Christianity. South Africa is obviously their country. Had the sterner councils of the more ruthless prevailed, they would have arrived in India strangers in a strange land. These would have suffered most if the Areas Reservation and Immigration (Further Provision) Bill, introduced into the House of Assembly by Dr. Malan, Minister of Interior and Health, had become law.

This Bill aimed at stopping the encroachment of Indians upon the social and commercial life of Europeans and coloured people and at reducing the Indian population of South Africa. Over 30,000 Indians have been repatriated voluntarily, and this policy will still be pursued.

As a result of the agitation awakened by this Bill, a deputation, with as its personnel Sir George F. Paddison, C.S.I., Sir Diva Prasad Sarvadhikary, and the Hon. Syed Rasa Ala, arrived in South Africa from India, its object being to make first-hand observations of the problem. The work was done so sympathetically and tactfully that the antagonistic feeling had been lessened considerably by the time the deputation departed and the South African parliamentary deputation sailed for India. This deputation was headed by the Minister of Mines and Industries, the Hon. F. W. Beyers. There were six members of the House of Assembly and a departmental representative. While in India these men were brought to consider the problem from many new aspects, and it was agreed that the Union Government would meet a delegation from India, when the problem would be discussed from every angle with the object of arriving at a solution satisfactory to both sides.

The Habibullah delegation was carefully selected. It was headed by Sir Muhammad Habibullah. There were seven other members, including Sir George Paddison and the Right Hon. Srinavasa Sastri, first Indian Agent-General in South Africa. The first conference took place in Cape Town on December 17, 1926, and by January 11, 1927, differences had been discussed so frankly and freely that eight articles, since known as the Cape Town Agreement, were drafted and subsequently approved by the Indian and South African Governments as a suitable basis for future guidance. The fundamental idea of this agreement is assisted emigration, and between 1927 and 1929 Indians left South Africa at the rate of 3000 a year. The number now has a tendency to dwindle, one reason for this being assigned to the negligence of the Indian Government in caring for emigrants according to the provisions of the Cape Town Agreement.

At this memorable conference it was resolved that:

1. Both Governments reaffirm their recognition of the right of South Africa to use all just and legitimate means for the maintenance of Western standards of life.

2. The Union Government recognise that Indians domiciled in the Union, who are prepared to conform to Western standards of life, should be enabled to do so.

3. For those Indians in the Union who may desire to avail themselves of it the Union Government will organise a scheme of assisted emigration to India or other countries where Western

standards are not required. Union domicile will be lost after three years' continuous absence from the Union in agreement with the proposed revision of the law relating to domicile, which will be of general application. Emigrants under the Assisted Emigration Scheme, who desire to return to the Union within the three years, will be allowed to do so only on refund to the Union Government of the cost of the assistance received by them.

4. The Government of India recognise their obligation to look after such emigrants on their arrival in India.

5. The admission into the Union of the wives and minor children of Indians permanently domiciled in the Union will be regulated by paragraph 3 of resolution 21 of the Imperial Conference of 1918.

6. In the expectation that the difficulties with which the Union has been confronted will be materially lessened by the agreement which has now happily been reached between the two Governments, and in order that the agreement may come into operation under the most favourable auspices and have a fair trial, the Government of the Union of South Africa have decided not to proceed further with the Areas Reservation and Immigration and Registration (Further Provision) Bill.

7. The two Governments have agreed to watch the working of the agreement now reached and to exchange views from time to time as to any change that experience may suggest.

8. The Government of the Union of South Africa have requested the Government of India to appoint an agent in the Union in order to secure continuous and effective co-operation between the two Governments.

The first Indian Agent-General was the Right Hon. Srinavasa Sastri, who was succeeded early in 1929 by Sir Venkata Reddi. Mr. Sastri was a notable success in South Africa. His remarkable ability as statesman, orator and writer, his personality and learning, had an admirable influence during the early period of the agreement's trial. He formed Indo-European councils in Durban and Johannesburg, the idea being to bring the two sections together on a common footing, so that problems may be discussed and a better understanding established. These councils, consisting of an equal number of Europeans and Indians, are doing excellent work.

An Indian problem of sorts still exists in South Africa. A certain section of the white community would solve it by repatriating every Indian in the country, as was done many years ago with the Chinese labourers in the Transvaal. The Indians, however, were invited to Natal with certain rights of domicile not promised the Chinese. The planters tried to obtain Indian [illegible]

was brought to South Africa, but Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India, refused to sanction the proposal. The planters were thus forced to grant the coolies the privileges desired.

But the Indians were not treated with the fairness expected of a British country. The European trader's bitterness at Indian undercutting can be understood, but not the rigorous legislation of a responsible Government. Soon after the union of the four provinces now comprising South Africa there was the passive resistance movement of Mr. Ghandi, which led to the Smuts-Ghandi Agreement. In the terms of this the South African Government contracted to treat Indians already in the country as British subjects, and the Indian Government agreed to restricted immigration. Free Indian immigration into Natal stopped in 1896, and after 1911 the Indian Government would not let its subjects emigrate to South Africa. No Indians have settled in the country since 1914. Before the motion restricting immigration, introduced in India by the late Mr. Gokhale, became law, Natal sugar planters, assisted by the Natal Government, tried to recruit as many Indians as possible. About eighty headmen were sent over, but, in spite of these and other efforts, the Indian Government would not allow any of its subjects to go to Natal.

The Indian trader—and his method is the principal one by which these people earn a livelihood in South Africa—is charged with a low commercial morality, of paying lower wages than the European and of underselling him. The Indian's answer to the first charge is that because some of his race err in this respect it does not argue that all are offenders. Traders from Central Europe are greater criminals. It is not fair either to level the other charges against the Indian trader only. Grocers and drapers in South Africa generally sell certain lines at figures lower than the wholesale prices. Instances, too, can be quoted where European tradesmen sell goods at lower prices than Indian shopkeepers a few yards away. And most of the large industrial and commercial firms in South Africa pay assistants scandalously low wages.

There is more foundation to the charge that Indians are insanitary and unhealthy in their mode of living. But it must not be forgotten that public health authorities have full power to deal with cases of lack of sanitation. In the same way the complaint that Indians have little interest in the affairs of the country is answered by the fact that, whatever their educational and other qualifications, they have little opportunity for doing so. Conditions have altered since 1926, but the white skilled worker still refuses the Indian the admission to his trade union which would enable the Indian to raise his standard. Exploitation of Indian and coloured labour is inevitable. There are few signs of

white trade unions in South Africa changing their attitude, bu that is the only solution to the problem they face.

The Indian population of South Africa is not increasin rapidly. During the ten years between 1911 and 1921 Indians in Natal, where they still outnumber the white races, increased 6 per cent. and the Europeans nearly 40 per cent. For the whole of South Africa there was an increase of 243,246 in the European population and 13,528 in the Asiatic population. There is thus little danger of the white races being swamped by yellow races The main reason for this slow rate of increase is the preponderance of Asiatic males; the wives of many resident Indians live in India. The restrictions placed upon immigration and inter provincial movements is another influence, and a third is the provisions of the Indian Relief Act of 1914, which allowed for the repatriation of Indians, with wives and children, who volunteered to return. In 1924 the Smuts Government intro duced a Class Areas Bill, a prominent provision of which was the reservation of definite areas in towns for European residence and trading. If this Bill had become law the Government would hav been able to force Indians to certain parts of towns. Asiatic protested violently against the proposed measure, but it was saved from becoming law by the dissolution of Parliament and the election of the Hertzog Government. A strong recast of this Class Areas Bill was the measure later introduced by Dr. Malan and the cause of the final agreement with India. On the whole Indians form a minor section of South Africa's population. The 1926 census was of the European race only, and that gave as the total 1,676,660. The total number of all races in the Union is now about 7,000,000. Of a non-European population of abou 5,500,000 the Indian proportion is very small.

The view is still held that with the increase of the nativ population the presence of even this small number of Indians must lead to unpleasant complications. Those who argue th way are inclined to credit Indians in South Africa with the abilit to increase at a much faster rate than the small number make physically possible. Altogether the problem seems to be solvin itself. In course of time the presence of Indians in South Afric will not be regarded as a problem. In the official forecasted progression of population up to 1971 no mention is made of the Asiatic element, which is obviously regarded as a negligible factor. The European population is then expected to reach nearly 5,000,000, while the native population will be abou 17,000,000.

Most Indians in South Africa are accused of sending money ou of the country and restricted in parts of Natal and the Cape from investing money in South Africa. Only Indians whose home i

in India and commercial domicile in South Africa regularly send money out of the country. In the Transvaal Indians may not buy land, and as far as possible they were kept from settling there. In addition to this, Europeans seem to forget that their people send money overseas and many business houses are financed from America and Europe. The Indian is not always wrong.

To-day the term 'assisted emigration' is used instead of the old one of 'repatriation scheme.' When it is remembered that many availing themselves of it were born in South Africa, it is obviously more correct. An alteration of more importance is the fact that emigrants are not compelled to sign a document relinquishing domicile and receive a small sum of money in return as compensation. The right of re-entry is thus retained, should the country in which settlement is attempted prove unsuitable. It is an important concession that Indian emigrants are treated on the same basis as those of other races. By the new Act all emigrants from South Africa who remain away three years lose their rights of domicile. The only exception is when the Minister of Interior issues a special permit.

In addition to, or in lieu of, the bonus monthly pensions are now issued to the sick and disabled. The distribution of these has been taken over by the Indian Government. The bonuses now offered are far more generous than under the old scheme, and another welcome alteration is the fixing of sixteen as the age of majority for children concerned in assisted emigration schemes. Previously children under sixteen would be admitted into South Africa as minors when their parents were domiciled in the Union, but when repatriated a man was compelled to take all his children under twenty-one with him. The required age in this case is now sixteen.

It has been said that the dispute between South Africa and India is as old as President Kruger, who is now but an historical figure. The last three years have been the most settled period since the beginning of Indian immigration to South Africa on November 17, 1860. It is also said that no satisfactory solution has yet been reached, but the altered feeling has ended a painful controversy and opened the way to a better understanding in the future. Before the South African War the Transvaal was the stumbling-block, but since then the leaders in the anti-Asiatic feeling have been the British sections. With Union the position of Indians rapidly became worse, well-meaning South African party leaders feeling it necessary to retain the support of their Natal adherents by ignoring the undoubtedly just demands of the Indian Government and of the leading Indians in South Africa. Indians once had parliamentary franchise in Natal, but lost it in 1896. Many years later municipal franchise was taken

from them. Individuals already registered, however, were allowed to continue to vote, but they would not elect a man of their own race. By combining Indians could elect a European to represent their interests.

Except for the hundred or so Indians serving as waiters and in similar capacities, the Orange Free State is closed to Asiatics. Many more have been admitted into the Transvaal, but they are not allowed to vote in municipal or parliamentary elections, have generally to live in locations, where houses are only occupied temporarily, and may not own immovable property. It is rare for new licences to be issued to Indians in the Transvaal; old licences are frequently renewed, occasionally with difficulty. From the Indian point of view the Cape is the most favoured province. Here they have municipal and parliamentary franchise. This is probably a survival of the sentiment prevailing when Cecil John Rhodes was Prime Minister of the Cape. His policy was one of equal laws for all civilised people, irrespective of race. But in the Cape, as much as in other parts of South Africa, theatres and cinemas are the subject of a strict segregation. They are designed either for coloured people or for Europeans. Hotels catering for Europeans will not admit Indians, who are also subject to many restrictions on long-distance trains and on ships. There was a time when they were not allowed on pavements, but that sort of foolishness has almost disappeared in South Africa to-day.

Educational facilities for Indians in South Africa have long been very poor. Until the opening of the Sastri College in Natal the only institution for higher education open to Indians was the South African Native College at Fort Hare. This college was opened by His Excellency the Governor-General of South Africa on December 14, 1929. The college is in Durban, and the six principal members of its staff are to be selected from among teachers in India.

In spite of the many injustices under which Indians in South Africa have laboured, there can be little doubt that in general they are better off in the Union than they would be in India. The idea that Indians in South Africa are pressed under cruelly, subject to disheartening periods of unemployment, to poverty and other hardships, is wrong. The proportion of wealthy Indians is much higher in South Africa than in India, where the country is so overcrowded and competition so keen that few men of this type could have risen high. Class for class, South African Indians are far more comfortable than their fellows in India.

The political and social interests of Indians are now guarded by the South African Indian Congress, with which are affiliated the Natal Indian Congress, the Transvaal Indian Congress, and

the Cape British Indian Council. This Congress is recognised by both the Indian and the South African Governments as representing the Indians of the Union. In the Transvaal, it might be mentioned incidentally, there are now nearly 16,000 Indians. Housing has been receiving much consideration from these bodies. In Durban a special Housing Board was appointed in 1928. Many important recommendations were embodied in the report, but so far nothing has been done to carry them out. Housing and sanitation, wages and organisation of tradesmen, and traders' licences are the main conditions in which a need for urgent improvement is felt.

A point on which there is always likely to be misunderstanding is the definition of Western standards, which fill so vital a place in the agreement. It has been said that this aspect of the problem is of no consequence, but to argue in this way is to ignore the fact that failure on the part of Indians to reach this standard renders them liable to be sent out of the country. Various definitions, some with legal sanction, have been tried, but on the whole they are not satisfactory. It has to be acknowledged that this Western standard differs with individuals; to expect the lowest class of Indian to live up to the ideals and habits of the best type of European is manifestly unjust. Personal cleanliness, habits, intellectual interests, amusements, modes of building and decorating form some of the vital differences between civilisation in the East and the West. The ability to accumulate wealth does not in itself constitute living up to a Western standard. In India itself some of the wealthiest people are the trading and moneylending castes, but the actual standard of living among these people is much below that of the poorer professional classes. Indians in South Africa live on very much the same style as certain classes of Europeans. No contrasts like that of cities and cantonments, as offered in India, are to be seen in the Union. A comparison of the design, cleanliness, and refinement of a cantonment with an adjoining native city will satisfy the most sceptical of the superiority of European methods and their difference from those of natives. In cities like Durban, where there are definite Indian areas, differences are noticed. Before condemning, however, it should be remembered that as many Europeans sink to the Indian level as Indians live up in the European way to the incomes they are earning. If sanitary and other laws are enforced without racial discrimination, difficulties here would readily disappear.

W. L. Speight.

120, Kloof Street, Cape Town.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN JERUSALEM

There are few features of the life of the Church of England so singular as the Church's representation in the Holy City, and the unique nature of that representation calls for the closest study and attention. There, in the Holy City of Jerusalem, side by side with the ecclesiastical buildings of the Greek, Latin, Armenian, Syrian, Coptic, and Abyssinian Churches, stands the Anglican Collegiate Church of St. George as an outward and visible sign of the embassy of our national Church to the religious capital of Christendom. If, even before the Great War, when Palestine formed part of the Ottoman Empire, it was deemed eminently desirable that the Church of England should be represented in Jerusalem, the establishment of a British mandate over the country has converted desirability into absolute necessity. In the last decade the religious significance of Jerusalem has been magnified. The Zionist policy of the British Government has had the effect of enhancing the position of the city in the eyes of the Jews, and for this very reason the people of Islam have stressed its sanctity as taking precedence next to the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. The Christian Churches have therefore worked for the maintenance and possible improvement of their position, while the Church of England has fulfilled her function as representing the national religion of the Power with paramount influence in the Holy Land.

Before attempting to describe the ambassadorial nature of the Jerusalem bishopric and its relations with other religious bodies represented in the Holy City, it is as well to give some account of how this bishopric came to be created. The failure of several attempts on the part of Lutheran Germany to recover episcopal orders through Rome led Frederick William IV. of Prussia to approach England, with a view to founding a bishopric in Jerusalem as a means of attaining that object. The bishopric was founded in 1841, its income being provided by the interest of an endowment fund raised in England and of a capital sum set aside from the privy purse of the King of Prussia. The nomination to the see thus financed was vested in England and Prussia alternately, the Archbishop of Canterbury nominating to the

Crown on the English side and having the right of veto on the Prussian nomination. The original objects publicly set forth as the aims towards which the bishop was to devote his efforts were, first, Christian unity, and, secondly, the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews, beginning at Jerusalem. Therefore, in the commendatory letter presented by the first bishop to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Archbishop of Canterbury said that the bishop was 'charged . . . not to intermeddle in any way with the jurisdiction of the prelates of the Eastern Churches' and 'by all means in his power to promote a mutual interchange of respect, courtesy and kindness,' and a 'hearty desire' was expressed to 'renew that amicable intercourse with the ancient Churches of the East which has been suspended for ages, and which, if restored, may have the effect, with the blessing of God, of putting an end to the divisions which have brought the most grievous calamities to the Church of Christ.' Further, in the authentic statement of the proceedings on the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric it is recorded that the bishop's 'chief missionary care will be directed to the conversion of the Jews, to their protection, and to their useful employment.'

The bishopric, as then founded, was distinctly unpopular with many Churchmen on account of its connexion with a non-episcopal communion, and because of their failure to appreciate the difference between episcopal jurisdiction as exercised in the West, where it is territorial, and in the East, where several bishops have jurisdiction in the same area, each over the members of their own communion. This led to the unfounded fear that there was an attempt to intrude on the rights of the Greek Patriarch as Bishop of Jerusalem. Changes, however, were approaching which altered the whole position. A further failure to obtain episcopal orders for the Lutherans, when Bishop Gobat referred a request from the King of Prussia for the consecration of certain Lutheran ministers, prepared the way for the withdrawal of Prussia from the contract; and on the death of Bishop Barclay in 1881 the bishopric fell into abeyance. It was not until six years later, in 1887, that it was reconstituted as an Anglican see by Archbishop Benson, and Dr. Blyth, then Archdeacon of Rangoon, was consecrated Bishop in Jerusalem and the East, the Greek Patriarch having said that it was 'necessary that a bishop of the Church of England . . . should be placed in the Holy City.' The aims of the bishopric—Christian unity on Catholic principles and the conversion of the Jews—remained as in 1841, but the bishopric itself was duly regularised. In the East there had never been any question on this point, and under Bishop Blyth's administration it gained rapid and solid support both at home and abroad, so that the bishop become recognised as the representative of the

whole Anglican communion among the other representative bishops in the Holy City.

During all this time the Patriarch of Jerusalem was most sympathetic towards Bishop Blyth, saying that 'mutual understanding and union will be best promoted if you show us services truly representing the uses in your Church'; and again, 'we welcome your missionary work,' after lamenting that the law of the Ottoman Empire prohibited such work on the part of the Churches in Palestine. The law being then as it was, the method of representation of the Church of England took the form of a church with schools and medical work attached to it; and the work was carried on not only in Jerusalem, the headquarters of the bishopric and of all the Christian Churches, but also in smaller centres where opportunity offered without interfering with the efforts of others. Means to carry on the work were provided by a fund opened with the offertory alms given at the bishop's consecration, and known as the Jerusalem Bishopric Mission Fund; but the name was afterwards changed to the Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund, so as to avoid confusion with the Bishopric Endowment Fund. In order to safeguard the continuity of work and legalise medical institutions in the Ottoman Empire, it was essential that schools, hospitals and dispensaries should be located in buildings belonging to their respective missions and protected by imperial firmans, and for this reason the bishop opened his Land and Buildings Fund, donations to which were limited to the objects specified by the donors, but the Mission Fund was, and still is, of the nature of an English diocesan fund, and is administered by the bishop at his discretion for missionary purposes. It was not, however, until 1894 that St. George's College buildings were begun, and it was only in 1910 that the group of buildings (church, bishop's house, clergy house, etc.) was finished; but if the *tout ensemble* has been the result of years of unremitting toil, it certainly fulfils the object of upholding the dignity of the Church of England in Jerusalem, and provides most suitable accommodation for the various activities of the mission. It is interesting to note that it was on the bishop's table at St. George's Close that the surrender of Jerusalem was signed by the Turkish commander on December 9, 1917. The Jerusalem bishopric then comprised Egypt and the Sudan, as well as Syria, Palestine, and Cyprus, but now that a separate bishop has been appointed for Egypt and the Sudan the jurisdiction of the present bishop (Dr. MacInnes) is confined to Palestine, Syria, Cyprus, and such parts of Asia Minor as are not assigned to the Bishop of Gibraltar. The Collegiate Church has the status of a cathedral, having the bishop's seat and a dean, archdeacon, and canons; but the style, although in general use, is not officially assumed, as the

Patriarch of Jerusalem is the Bishop of Jerusalem, and Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the cathedral of the Ho City.

Under present conditions the objects of the mission ha undergone little material change, except that the missiona work has been extended to Moslems, and has become more fruit in this direction in consequence of the emancipation of the peo of Palestine and Syria from the domination of the Turks. It m be summarised as follows:

1. The establishment and maintenance of mission work amo the Jews and Moslems in Bible lands.

2. The provision of Church privileges for English Churc people resident therein.

3. The maintenance of relations of Christian charity, now happily established, with the other Christian Churches repr sented in Jerusalem, especially the Eastern Orthodox Churc with a view to co-operation on Catholic principles and to th promotion of Christian unity, as laid down in the statement o the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop London on the reconstitution of the bishopric in 1887.

The essentially ambassadorial nature of the bishopric impose upon it the twofold duty of keeping the Church at home informe regarding the religious position in Palestine and of maintainin such relations with other Churches and religions as to enable i to use the influence it believes to be for their help and benefit and it was with this aspect in view that St. George's began t grow to its present dimensions. Long before the cathedral w consecrated in 1898 the then Orthodox patriarch suggested bot to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Anglican Bishop o Jerusalem that a church should be built in the Holy City to sho to the Eastern Orthodox Church the manner of worship of th Anglican communion in its most seemly form, and the patriarc believed that this would draw the two Churches together bette than any other means. That His Beatitude's forecast was correc has been amply proved by the remarkable progress made i Anglican-Orthodox relations to which I will refer later in thi article. But, although the bishop's activities must necessaril be multifarious, one common feature unites them all, and the are all governed by one ideal—namely, that the primary functio of the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem is the worthy representatio of the Anglican communion in the Holy City and the Holy Lan This principle is carried out by every other branch of the Church from the Church of Rome to that of Abyssinia. Moreove Palestine is a country peopled neither by a nation nor by differe races, but by individuals of different religions, so that a man religion is of much more importance than his nationality. T

therefore follows that, as Great Britain has been delegated to guide and protect these people politically, the religious side of the British race cannot escape their careful scrutiny, and must necessarily be shown to them in such a way as to earn their respect and justify their confidence. This is the function of the Jerusalem and the East Mission, whose primary object is to create a friendly atmosphere of mutual study and, in the case of non-Christians, to produce a body of people who, while still remaining Jews or Moslems, will at least oppose current and controversial travesties of Christianity. The position of the bishop is not an easy one. As in the case of an ambassador, it is not only essential that he should be trusted by those whom he represents, but that he should be acceptable to and trusted by those to whom he is accredited. If an ambassador cannot gain the confidence of the people to whom he is sent, or if circumstances arise which, in spite of the representative's own efforts to the contrary, bring him under suspicion, his usefulness, or even the smallest possibility of his usefulness, ceases and every action on his part is misconstrued and resisted. How to gain and maintain this confidence is a problem of which there is no definite solution. All who assume such representative duties have to solve the question for themselves according to the special circumstances in which they are placed, the type of people among whom they are sent, and their own personal qualities. The means that they can use and the influences that they can bring to bear vary in each individual case; but one factor remains constant irrespective of local or personal peculiarities—namely, that any manner of usefulness depends solely on the representative's degree of success in penetrating to the very depths the life, thought and mind of the people in question, in acquiring a thorough knowledge of their literature and ideals, in understanding their limitations, and in sympathising with their prejudices. This is the task which the bishop and his staff have been called upon to undertake, and results have already more than proved the success of their mission.

One of the canons of St. George's is specially appointed as an expert in Jewish work, and the bishop, knowing the unfriendly attitude of the Jews towards Christianity as a result of centuries of persecution, asked this canon to make himself fully acquainted with the Jewish hopes for a National Home in Palestine and to form points of contact with the educated and leading Jews of all classes. Dr. Herbert Danby set to work nine years ago, and the contacts which he has formed have at least shown that the church is sympathetic and friendly to all the finer aspirations of Jewish life. He met the Jews on common ground—in literature, scholarship, Oriental study, and music, in all of which he is an expert—with the result that he has now formed lasting friendships with

many of the most intellectual and cultured Jews in Palestine, and has even been asked by the leading Zionists to publish lectures given by him on the Jewish attitude towards Christianity. This is ample proof that a considerable step forward has been taken in the creation of a better atmosphere, and it is significant that Dr. Danby has become so prominent in Jewish intellectual activity that he is helping to supervise the completion of a *Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew* compiled by the late Eliezer Ben Yehudah, the Jewish genius who was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the revival of the Hebrew language. It is also intended that a canon of St. George's should become an expert in work on the Moslem side, but owing to financial difficulties this side of the work has not yet been fully regularised, although Moslem relations are efficiently maintained and promoted by the bishop himself and by members of the mission staff with a knowledge of the Arabic language. The relations between St. George's close and the Moslem religious hierarchy are very cordial, and an example of the mutual sympathy existing between the two religious bodies is to be found in the fact that the Anglican bishop was one of the first to offer his congratulations to King Hussein on his assumption of the caliphate in 1924, on which occasion he was decorated by the King of the Hedjaz. Both the Jewish and Moslem work is carried out by missionaries specially trained in their particular branches, by means of schools and colleges which attract ever-increasing numbers, and by the services of St. Luke's Hospital, which has recently been moved from Haifa to Hebron. Education and medical treatment are irrespective of race and religion, and while St. Luke's Hospital treats in-patients and out-patients, Moslems and Jews, as well as native Christians, and provides visitations to the sick of the neighbouring villages, St. George's School educates boys of British, Palestinian, American, Armenian, German, Swedish, Russian, Persian, and Iraqi nationality, representing the Anglican, Jewish, Moslem, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Syrian Orthodox, Abyssinian and Baha'i religions. From every point of view it is impossible to speak too highly of St. George's School in Jerusalem, which offers to Oriental youth, be he Christian, Moslem or Jew, the best that Britain has to give.

It is, however, important to remember that from a missionary point of view the British residents are of supreme importance. Although comparatively few in number, most of them hold positions of responsibility where their actions are intimately bound up with their religion, and the church's help is necessary for the full and adequate discharge of their duties to Church and State. Since the British Government accepted the mandate for Palestine many Government officials of all grades have gone to that country,

and the Church of England is responsible for them, as well as for the ever-increasing number of visitors and pilgrims who annually visit the Holy Land. For this purpose a British chaplaincy has been created under the superintendence of the archdeacon while an up-to-date pilgrim hostel has been open for several years as a counterpart of the older hospices of the sister Churches in Jerusalem.

As far as the relationships with the Eastern Churches are concerned, marked progress has been made in recent years. Experts on the position of the Eastern Churches form part of the mission staff, and friendships, which there is every hope will prove lasting, have been formed with the Greek and Armenian patriarchates. The history of Anglican-Orthodox relations is too large a subject to elaborate here, but the work of recent years has brought about two most significant results which cannot be passed unnoticed. First, mutual sympathy and understanding have gained so much ground that the Orthodox Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have now definitely acknowledged the validity of Anglican orders ; and, secondly, it has been agreed that where clergy of the Anglican or Orthodox Churches are out of reach of a church building of their own Church they can avail themselves of the church buildings of the other Church with the sanction of the local bishop. Inter-communion has not yet been reached, but an important practical outcome of the effort at friendly approach is shown in the following letter written in 1919 by the Orthodox Archbishop of Melbourne to the Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane :

> I have received an encyclical from the Holy Synod of Athens authorising me to advise that all members of our Church (not within reach of ministrations from their own clergy) should avail themselves of the ministrations and Sacraments of the Church of England. . . . Where your priests desire and can come into touch with our people, in any attempt they may make to invite them to the ministrations and Communion of your Church, they will be acting with my freely and gladly given sanction, as I recognise that they will be doing a service both to our people and our Church.

As far as the Greek Church is concerned the above clearly shows the value of the work done by the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem.

There are, however, two other Eastern Churches with which the Anglican bishopric has the most cordial relations—those of Abyssinia and Assyria. In 1921 an embassy from Her Royal Highness the Empress of Abyssinia arrived in Jerusalem in order to request the recovery of the rights which the Abyssinian Church had lost in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre ; and His Excellency Dejtch Gabra Salassi,[1] head of this mission, conveyed to Dr.

[1] Governor-General of the Northern Province of Abyssinia and counsellor to the Empress Zawdito.

MacInnes, the Anglican bishop, the personal greetings of the Empress, presenting to him at the same time a brass benediction cross and an illuminated manuscript of the Abyssinian Gospels, in recognition of the sympathy and help which the Anglican bishop had so often shown to the representatives of Abyssinian Christianity in Jerusalem. Then later, in 1924, His Highness Ras Tafari, Prince Regent of Abyssinia, visited St. George's Close, and took occasion to present a sum of money, five enormous sacks of coffee, a beautiful benediction cross of pure gold, and three volumes in the ancient Ethiopic language, besides decorating the bishop with the Star of Ethiopia. Scarcely less significant of the high regard in which the bishop is held throughout the Middle East was the visit of Mar Shimun, Patriarch Catholicos of the Assyrian Christians, who as a mere boy of fifteen spent some days in Jerusalem in 1925 and took part in the services at St. George's Cathedral. This youthful patriarch is the temporal and spiritual ruler of the Assyrians or Nestorians, over whom he holds unlimited powers, and represents a people of the highlands of Kurdistan who were our staunch allies in the Great War.

The relation between the Anglican bishopric and the Palestine Government is practically that the one is the complement of the other. Religion plays so important a part in all Palestine matters that close co-operation between the Church and the Administration is essential, while in education and public health the Jerusalem and the East Mission gives substantial help to the Government departments concerned and receives their assistance in return. Even in police duties the staff of the mission has rendered valuable service; for in the recent crisis every available member performed the duties of special constable until the arrival of sufficient British troops to control the situation.

Of the many English pilgrimages that have recently visited St. George's Cathedral perhaps the most interesting was that of the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, of which the bishop is chaplain, in the spring of 1926. Besides having the Ophthalmic Hospital of the Order, which has long done magnificent work to combat eye diseases so prevalent among the *fellahin*, they have St. John's Chapel in the Anglican cathedral as their official place of worship; and the presence of the Order once more in the Holy Land was a reminder that the great spirit of charity that fired the hearts of the knights of St. John 800 years ago is ever present in the hearts of their successors to-day. Not only has their work brought credit and enhanced prestige to that Venerable Order, but it has substantially assisted the ambassadorial representation of the Church of England.

Jerusalem, from which might be expected to radiate a spirit of peace, has been positively notorious throughout the centuries

r violent ecclesiastical disputes in which trivialities have played ie greater part. Since the war, however, considerable progress as been made to reduce ecclesiastical strife to the minimum, and e Anglican bishopric has missed no opportunity of encouraging armonious co-operation. The most striking testimony of the ccess of this policy is to be found in the thanksgiving service eld every year on December 9, the anniversary of the liberation f Jerusalem by Lord Allenby—an event for which the greater art of the contending factions are united in their varying degrees f gratitude. This impressive and unique ceremony, held in the nglican Cathedral of St. George the Martyr under the direction f the Anglican bishop, has been attended by the High Comissioner and the heads of the Palestine Administration, as well s by the Moslem mayor and the chief notables of the city. The atriarchs of the Greek Orthodox and Armenian Churches have ttended and taken part in the service. The leading ecclesiastical ignitaries of the Syrian, Coptic, and Abyssinian Churches have eats by the high altar. The Grand Mufti, Chief Rabbi, and epresentatives of the Arab and Jewish communities have formed art of the congregation, and the consuls of the foreign Powers have ttended, irrespective of the Church to which they belong. Parts f the service are conducted in English, others in Arabic, Hebrew, reek, and Armenian ; and differences of race, creed, and language re no obstacle to unity of purpose. Nowhere else in the world it possible annually to witness a procession of patriarchs, with ill robes and decorations, all of different Churches, entering an nglican cathedral at the invitation of an Anglican bishop, fully obed with cope and mitre. The sun-lit cloisters form a dignified ackground to this brilliant procession of peace as it passes along eaded by the *kawasses* of the different patriarchates and conılates, dressed in their rich Oriental uniforms. The High Comissioner's guard of honour is drawn up at attention in the uadrangle ; the Union Jack flies from the masthead of St. eorge's close ; and the strains of the National Anthem mark the pening of this universal thanksgiving in the Holy City.

E. W. POLSON NEWMAN.

BRUSSELS A HUNDRED YEARS AGO

Behind the busiest streets of Brussels lies hidden a square—so still, so old world, that on entering it one seems to step back into the spacious leisurely days of long ago. The houses are all uniform—of greystone, with massive pediments and rows of pillars. Pediment fronts pediment, pillar matches pillar across the square.

It was known as the Place St. Michel in that past time when its magnificent houses were the habitation of 'rank and fashion.' Now it bears another name, and its dim and dusty mansions, fallen from their high estate, serve as offices and warehouses.

In the centre is a garden with a monument. Belgium, a crowned woman, stands there in stone, beside her lion; chains lie about her feet. With proud, free gesture she inscribes an immortal deed upon a scroll.

Around the statue has been dug a crypt with cloisters; on iron doors under its arches many names are engraved. Funeral wreaths hang there, in varying stages of mournful decay.

This spot is holy ground—a place of pilgrimage—for here lie buried 600 citizens of Brussels who perished in the revolution of 1830.

Belgium has throughout the ages been under the domination of some alien power. France, Spain and Austria succeeded one another as her overlord, till in the early nineteenth century Napoleon brought her back under the heel of France. When that titanic empire fell, the Powers of Europe concerted to wrest Belgium from Gallic dominion and to establish a barrier State by uniting all the Low Countries under the sceptre of William I. of Holland.

Though Belgium would have preferred the restoration of the Austrian *régime*, she was ready at first to accept the situation philosophically. It was the inconceivable tactlessness of the Dutch which engendered the revolution of 1830.

There were obvious difficulties, of course, in harmonising the two countries. The chief stumbling-block was religion; the

cleavage between Catholic Belgium and Calvinistic Holland ha widened, if anything, during the past two centuries.

The proclamation of liberty of conscience for all seems to now a logical solution of the struggle between the two cults the position of 'State religion.' Unfortunately it satisfied neith party.

National jealousies, too, added their note of inevitable discor The Dutch demanded that Amsterdam should be the capital the new kingdom; the Belgians, naturally, urged the claims Brussels. The matter was finally left in abeyance! The co stitution of the two Chambers was the subject of bitter discussi before the Belgians consented to equality of political represent tion; they had laid claim to a proportion of two to three, cor sponding to the greater density of their population over t Dutch.

The draft Constitution—'the Fundamental Law'—was su mitted to the approval of the Belgians in characteristically d ingenuous fashion. '*Notables*' were chosen in each district local authorities to vote on the subject, in the proportion of o representative for each 2000 souls. William, fearing the unpop larity of the Liberty of Conscience clause, tried to forestall prote by excluding religious matters from the suffrage; these statute he said, had been imposed upon him by his compact with t Powers.

The Constitution was, indeed, received with universal di favour. The Catholics regarded liberty of conscience as a synony for the condonation of error, and the proposed liberty of the Pre offended the Church as greatly as did the annulment of the ancie right of the clergy to sit in the National Assembly. The Belgia hierarchy petitioned the King for the redress of these grievance but no reply was vouchsafed them. The Bishop of Ghent, Mauri de Broglie, who was the soul of the opposition, then led his pee in proclaiming, by pastoral letter, that Catholics could not conscience support the Fundamental Law.

Voting took place between August 14 and 18, 1815. 796 vot were registered against the Constitution and 527 for it. The were 280 abstainers. Of the dissentients, 126 announced th they had acted from religious motives.

In spite of this adverse majority, the Constitution was impose immediately upon the country. William had even the audaci to proclaim that the result of the referendum had been favourabl His peculiar reasoning was explained as follows in a proclam tion:

The 280 abstentions were counted as affirmatives, for silen might be interpreted as consent.

Religion having been excluded from the vote, the number

conscientious objectors—126—was not only deducted from the negatives, but classed among the affirmatives!

This violation of their rights was received with surprising calm by the Belgians, and the clergy themselves lapsed into quietude. The situation, however, remained intensely strained.

When William was inaugurated as sovereign in Brussels there were some demonstrations of loyalty. Yet even on that day there were clouds. The address from the throne was spoken only in Dutch—a capital mistake in a city which was certainly half French-speaking. The people, too, were disappointed because the customary largesse thrown to the crowd was not of silver coin, according to precedent, but of copper—a misplaced economy which earned William the soubriquet of 'Koperen Koning' ('Copper King').

William's eldest son, the Prince of Orange, a handsome, dashing young man, who had distinguished himself on the field of Waterloo, had a real sympathy for the Belgians, and was popular with them. He and his bride, the Grand Duchess Anna Paulowna of Russia, spent much time in Brussels. As early as 1816 the Prince perceived the seriousness of the general discontent. To his close friend, the Duke of Wellington, he wrote:

> The spirit of the Belgians becoming daily worse and more dissatisfied on account of the entire influence of the Dutch—who have all the business in hand, and consider Belgium daily more as an annexed province which is to be submissive to the Mother Country—it seems to me of great importance to check this bad spirit as much as possible. The King is exclusively surrounded by Dutch, who, although his intentions are the fairest and the best, lead him to be decidedly partial in favour of the Dutch, and this being the case, he is made to be quite averse to my being settled for the greatest part of each year in Brussels, which is the general wish of the Belgians, and might be very useful, for you know how easily that nation is gained and amused by a court, and when amused they forget to a great extent their grievances.

The Prince had, unfortunately, little influence with his father; and under the latter's blundering rule matters went steadily from bad to worse.

Belgium, already smarting under religious disabilities, began to suffer financially. She was obliged to bear half a national debt in the making of which she had had no part; the tax on wheat fell exclusively on her, since in her provinces lay the only corn-producing lands in the kingdom. Low import duties, on the other hand, afforded her, a manufacturing country, no protection for her industries.

Further objectionable measures were promulgated. Dutch was made the official language for the whole country, obligatory

or all who held employment under Government. Naturally the Walloons, who represent 50 per cent. of the population of Belgium, chafed under this edict. Teachers, religious and lay, were required to obtain from their local authorities a permit to exercise their functions; no school or college where Latin was taught might be opened without the sanction of the Minister of the Interior. Thus the entire educational system of a country wholly Catholic and half French-speaking was controlled by the Dutch Calvinistic Government. Simultaneously a secular College of Philosophy was opened at Louvain, and candidates for the priesthood were ordered to pass examination there before receiving ordination. The law forbade any candidate who should henceforth be educated or ordained abroad to exercise his priestly function in Belgium.

What advantage could William expect to obtain by this gadfly policy? Yet, strange as it may seem, his intentions were, as his son said, 'the fairest and best.' He was sincerely labouring, according to his own not very brilliant lights, for the fusion of the two countries so arbitrarily united under his sceptre. He was, moreover, not lacking in a certain shrewdness; his business acumen was remarkable. Belgium was undoubtedly indebted to him for the rapid renascence of her commercial prosperity after the devastating Napoleonic wars. But benefits were forgotten in exasperation.

William bore the sole responsibility for his unpopularity. He governed as he willed, keeping his Ministers in subservience by the simple method of dismissing those who dared to oppose him. Enamoured of his own ideas, he continued to blind himself to the increasing unrest. The fact that during a royal progress he had not been badly received by the Flemish population—whose race and language naturally inclined them to be more tolerant of the Dutch than were their neighbours of the French-speaking provinces—completely atoned, in his eyes, for the attitude of the Walloon towns; an attitude so menacing as to oblige him to curtail his tour. He ascribed unpleasant incidents to the agitation of a small minority, believing the mass of the people to be well satisfied.

Discontent finally broke out in a violent Press campaign, in a flood of seditious pamphlets. Then it was seen how little the 'liberty of the Press,' which had so alarmed the bishops, counted in the eyes of William. All who were guilty of adverse criticism were arrested and tried; many were thrown into prison. Louis de Potter, the most active of the agitators—who was first imprisoned and then condemned to eight years' banishment and deported—was a Liberal and a Freethinker; yet he and his party made common cause with the Catholics against the oppressor. William failed to realise the danger to him of this unique con-

junction—the union of clerical and anti-clerical against the enemy of both.

A monster petition of protest had no effect on William, but a new attitude on the part of the Belgian deputies to the Parliament at The Hague did, for a moment, shake his self-confidence. The occasional subservience of some of these deputies had hitherto furnished the King with the bare majority necessary to pass his measures; now they united in a solid block against their Dutch colleagues. The deadlock forced William to withdraw two of his edicts—the educational laws and the compulsory use of Dutch. But, characteristically, he forfeited the good of this alleviation by establishing the exclusive seat of the High Court and of all Government departments in Holland. Belgium, naturally, was enraged afresh.

While matters were in this ferment there arrived news of the fall of the French King and the setting up of a constitutional monarchy under the Orleans branch of the Bourbons. Barricades had been erected in Paris, there had been fighting, blood had flowed, the people in arms had prevailed against trained troops; it was a stimulating example.

Demonstrations took place in Brussels—isolated incidents, like small sporadic fires, all tending towards a general conflagration. They culminated in the famous scene at the Théâtre de la Monnaie on the evening of August 25, 1830.

It was perhaps with the connivance of the leaders of the agitation that the opera chosen that night was *La Muette de Portici;* anyhow, the work, with its evocation of liberty and patriotism, served their purpose well. When the tenor sang Masaniello's famous appeal—

> Shake off the yoke which crushes us—
> Let the stranger fall beneath our blows!
> May the holy love of our native land
> Inspire us with daring and courage!
> My country gave me life,
> I will give my country liberty!—

groups rose among the audience and took up the song in chorus It was a concerted movement, the secret of which had been well kept. The demonstrators then rushed out into the Place de la Monnaie, shouting 'Down with the Dutch! Down with the Ministers!'

They were immediately reinforced by a mob, which had been awaiting this signal. It was not the best element of the population which came to the fore that night; but then the work to do was not for the squeamish. The insurgents broke into the gunsmiths' shops and armed themselves, before proceeding to sack and burn the houses of the Dutch Ministers, and the office of

e Government newspaper, the *National*. Believing that the rmy would refuse to attack them, they passed confidently in ront of a detachment of grenadiers, who had been hastily posted ear the Place Royale. But the soldiers, obeying orders, fired, nd five Belgians were killed and many wounded.

From the hour of this first shedding of blood the revolution eld full sway. There was a certain ebb and flow, but the flood teadily gathered volume until the day came when it burst the arriers.

Meanwhile there was danger of mob rule. The Dutch Govern- nent and the municipal authorities seemed paralysed by the vents of that night. The restoration of order and the protection property had to be undertaken by the citizens. The energy and ficiency shown then by the burghers of Brussels can never be ufficiently extolled. They organised among themselves a Garde Bourgeoise,' or Burgher Guard, of several thousand men, ne command of which they confided to an ex-cavalry officer, Baron d'Hoogvorst. The burgomaster gladly recognised and ncouraged the Garde Bourgeoise, which was indeed to prove the ole governing power in the city for the next few weeks. It was he guard who issued admonitory proclamations, disarmed the evolutionary element, and substituted the tricolour of Brabant or the French tricolour (which had made a sporadic appearance mong a section of the insurgents)—emphasising thereby the ational and patriotic character of the revolution. The com- nander of the Dutch garrison deemed it the best policy to accept truce with this effective body, pending negotiations with Holland.

On August 29 a deputation of five prominent citizens departed or The Hague to carry the nation's demands to the King.

Sire, [so ran the address they bore] Never in a like crisis did good itizens more greatly deserve the esteem of Your Majesty and the gratitude f the public. By their firmness and courage they have quelled in three ays a most dangerous effervescence, and made grave disorders to cease. But, Sire, . . . the discontent has deep roots; everywhere the conse- uences are apparent of the disastrous system followed by ministers who efuse to recognise alike our desires and our needs.

Thus did the Belgian leaders tactfully lay upon William's nfortunate Ministers the blame which, they well knew, attached nly to the King himself.

The good citizens of Brussels [the petition continues] have despatched hese emissaries to obtain the happy assurance that the evils of which they omplain will be removed as soon as they are made known. The under- igned are convinced that one of the best means of arriving at this most esirable end would be the prompt convocation of the States General.

Here followed the signature of Baron d'Hoogvorst and forty-three other names, representative of the nobility, the army, the law, medicine, industry, and trade.

Meanwhile William, on hearing the news of the revolt, had immediately sent troops to the environs of Brussels, by forced marches, under the leadership of the Prince of Orange and Prince Frederic.

The Prince of Orange arrived at Vilvorde on August 30 and invited the commander of the Burgher Guard to wait upon him there immediately. When d'Hoogvorst accompanied by four 'notables' appeared at the royal headquarters they displayed upon their breasts broad sashes of the colours of Brabant. This silent affirmation of nationalism was a challenge, and the Prince knew it.

The conversation proved fruitless; and he had to confine himself to the intimation of his intention of making a 'peaceful progress' through the city at the head of his troops. He stipulated that the tricolour should not be displayed.

The delegates replied that they would debate the question with their colleagues, and withdrew without having committed themselves.

When the account of the interview became public, the people's indignation knew no bounds. Between 8000 and 10,000 men enrolled themselves in the Burgher Guard in one day; the bells of Sainte Gudule and of lesser churches rang out a ceaseless tocsin; formidable barriers were erected in the city in the style of the recent Paris revolution. A curt reply was sent to the Prince: Brussels offered a safe conduct for himself and his staff, but no troops would be admitted. The flag would not be removed.

It was a staggering blow; trusting, however, in his popularity, the Prince accepted the humiliating terms.

On the morning of September 1, therefore, he presented himself at the bridge of Laeken accompanied by six officers and two servants, all on horseback. The chiefs of the Burgher Guard received him, and a small opening was made in the barricades to allow his passage. The guard, in their improvised uniform—a blue peasant blouse and a military cap—lined the streets three deep. They were fortuitously armed; some with rifles, others with swords, here and there a few with butchers' knives and axes. Behind them thronged vast crowds. The Prince's brow darkened as he beheld the forbidden tricolour; pinned on the breasts of men and women, hanging from balconies and window sills—on all sides fluttered the ominous red, yellow, and black.

Heavy silence reigned at first; then here and there—for there were still a few Orangists in the town—arose a rare cry:

'Vive le Roi!' Immediately the greeting was drowned in a roar of voices: 'Vive la liberté!'

The Prince, though deathly pale, kept up a show of fearlessness and affability. He chatted with his aides-de-camp, waved and smiled to the sullen populace that surged ever more menacingly around him, pressing against his horse's flanks, and closing their ranks behind him as he passed.

Such was the situation all the way to the Hôtel de Ville, where the unfortunate Prince had to submit to a long harangue from the burgomaster. It was here that, looking round on the wall of hostile faces surrounding him, his courage gave way. Perceiving a gap in the crowd near the Rue de la Violette, he suddenly spurred his horse, and, to the horror of his entourage, leaped a barricade and set off at full gallop. He never drew rein until he reached the Place Royale, where the Dutch garrison had bivouacked since August 25.

His officers and his Belgian escort hastened after him, helter-skelter. The flustered Prince received them exceedingly badly. 'What do you want? Is it a revolution?' he demanded; then burst into invective against the insulting display of the 'revolutionary colours' of Brabant.

It was, however, only a passing ebullition. His statesmanship soon reasserted itself, and the same evening he issued a conciliatory proclamation, thanking the guard in the King's name for their services and announcing the formation of a commission to discuss measures 'for the restoration of calm and confidence.'

Towards nightfall on that eventful day the deputation returned from The Hague, and the next afternoon the result of the embassy became known. The King had received the deputies 'benevolently,' informing them that he had forestalled their wishes by summoning the States General for September 13. His Majesty further observed that he held too much 'to his royal dignity' to yield 'as one who had a pistol to his head.' He would, however, endeavour to conciliate all interests. The princes must enter Brussels with their troops, and thus terminate a situation which offered a pernicious example. Finally, His Majesty expressed his desire for peace, 'several times reiterating, with deep emotion, his horror of bloodshed.'

Belgium was in no mood to be lulled by ambiguous promises or quelled by veiled threats. The convocation of the States General, though demanded by their own 'notables,' irritated the people at this juncture. It appeared to them an empty boon, since the system of representation left them at the mercy of the King.

Immediately the proclamation was published angry crowds began to assemble, and the situation soon grew alarming. Towards

nightfall the mob tore the proclamations down, burned them, a in melodramatic gesture of defiance, hurled the ashes in direction of the Hôtel de Ville. From high and low alike w heard the cry for 'Separation! Separation!'

The Prince's secret ambition here undoubtedly met the wis of the Belgians. He started for The Hague the following d bearing the people's ultimatum—an unequivocal demand for th administrative separation from Holland, under the viceroya of the Prince of Orange. He agreed to leave Brussels in the s charge of the Garde Bourgeoise, and the whole of the Du garrison accordingly evacuated the city on September 3, rema ing encamped near Vilvorde.

A deceptive calm reigned during the next fortnight. Neit the ambiguous tenor of the speech from the throne at t opening of the States General at The Hague on September 14 r the hostility of the Dutch Press provoked any demonstration Brussels. The Burgher Guard quietly increased its effectiv Arms and cannon were mysteriously forthcoming; reinforceme arrived from Liége, Louvain, and other cities. A 'commissio public safety' was organised as a civil auxiliary to the volunt force. It was, however, a false step on the part of the co mission which provoked the final explosion. On September this body issued an 'order of the day' condemning skirmis with the Dutch outside Brussels and acts of pillage on the p of the more fiery of the patriots. Such moderation was qu sufficient in those days of public effervescence to brand the co missioners as traitors in the eyes of the populace. The m violent element had indeed for some time steadily been gaini the upper hand, and now definitely threw off all control. T leaders of the movement and the officers of the Burgher Gua became suddenly powerless before the forces they had themsel fostered.

The night of the 19th was hideous with rioting. The to resounded with clamour, cries of 'To arms! . . . Forward beating of drums, noise of running feet. The Garde Bourgeo resisted the insurgents with admirable self-control; the m which attacked the town hall was repulsed innumerable tin without a single casualty among the rioters. But the ne morning the building was finally stormed by 1500 men, who, w great shouts of 'Liberty!' battered down the heavy doors a possessed themselves of the arms concealed within.

In this crisis several of the 'notables' fled. Others, m valorous, attempted the constitution of yet another provisio Government. But no leadership could avail any more. Fr that hour the populace was supreme.

It has been asserted that overtures were made by cert

nameless Brussels personalities to Prince Frederic, asking for the co-operation of his troops in the restoration of order. If true, this might be an excuse for the unfortunate decision which he now took.

Assuming that the city was divided against itself, and that he would be welcomed by 'the best citizens,' he issued his famous proclamation of September 21, in which he ordered Brussels to open her gates to his army, insisting once more on the abolition of the colours of Brabant, and promising amnesty to all who were not 'guilty of acts too criminal to escape the law's severity.'

The effect of this effusion may be imagined. Prince Frederic wasted the next two days in little skirmishes outside Brussels; meanwhile the city organised her defence. When at dawn on the 23rd the King's army marched on four of the town gates they found themselves confronted with a formidable resistance.

At the gates of Laeken and Flanders the attacks were easily beaten off, but at those of Schaerbeck and Louvain they were more deadly. At Schaerbeck the enemy pressed in after a desperate struggle, and, bringing up sixteen cannon, bombarded the whole length of the Rue Royale. A column, 1800 strong, then charged up the street, meeting with no further opposition until they reached the intersecting points of the Rue Treurenberg and the Rue de Louvain, where a strong barricade had been erected. A fierce battle took place here, and the advance was stopped. The Dutch, attempting an outflanking movement, passed through the Rue Ducale into the Parc. The defending forces were concentrated just beyond, holding the upper part of the Rue Royale and the whole of the Place Royale. From thence an intense fire from such cannon as the Belgians possessed poured on to the invading troops in the Parc. Sharpshooters, posted in the windows of the neighbouring houses, picked off their victims while remaining themselves in comparative security. The confined wooded gardens where the Dutch entrenched became for them a death-trap.

Meanwhile, the detachment of cavalry which had successfully forced the Louvain gate, being repulsed in its turn at the Treurenberg barricade, galloped round to await events near the Porte de Namur. The Belgians closed in behind them and retook the Louvain gate.

That evening Prince Frederic, panic-stricken, sought to come to terms with d'Hoogvorst, who, naturally, refused to forgo the hardly won advantage. Moreover, the situation grew hourly more auspicious. The access to Brussels was open on the south, and volunteers were streaming in from the provinces, bringing fresh arms and provisions. During the four days of battle the

Belgians waxed in numbers, while the Dutch waited vainly for their promised reinforcements.

A bombardment started a widespread conflagration, and it was believed that, by order of the Prince, red-hot cannon balls had been fired into the town. 'He wants to burn down our city!' was the cry in every mouth, and hatred redoubled the people's valour.

One of a deputation of citizens, who of their own initiative ventured into the enemy camp in the vain hope of arresting the civil war, hurled at Prince Frederic this protest of fine imagery: 'Can you not see that with every drop of blood that falls, with every spark that rises from the burning city, a fragment of your father's crown crumbles away?'

It was literally 'the people in arms.' Authority and discipline were non-existent. The officers named by the Burgher Guard were ignored. Here and there an old soldier of the Napoleonic wars might be seen directing a handful of the more docile volunteers, but for the most part everyone fought as he pleased.

It is astounding that these men, in all some 7000, untrained, undirected, ill-armed, with only ten guns (of which four were of small calibre), with no horses, should have routed a professional army of nearly twice their numbers, well provided with artillery and cavalry. It was a victory of spirit over matter.

Their method of warfare, if primitive, was effective. During the attacks on the gates women and children had poured boiling water and cast paving stones and every available missile from the windows on the heads of the advancing troops. The volunteers had possession of the houses near the Parc; piercing the dividing walls inside, they extended their line unperceived round the Dutch encampment. In these advantageous positions the marksmen continued to fire from behind casements, from the scaffolding-holes of the buildings, from beneath loosened roof tiles. Not an enemy soldier could advance beyond the trenches in the Parc without becoming a target for a hidden rifle.

It was a quaint feature of the strife that with the fall of dusk hostilities ceased. It was a kind of unspoken pact that the night should bring peace. 'Like the workmen, they end their toil at evening,' wrote an eye-witness. The Dutch perhaps took advantage of the respite to perfect their entrenchments, whilst the Belgians worked at their house-tunnelling, but neither side ever made any attempt at a surprise attack. Some of the patriots kept a semblance of watch, indeed, but by far the majority either went home to supper and bed or passed the time in the cafés. At sunrise the tocsin of Sainte Gudule, hushed too during the dark hours, rang out again; the drums beat in the streets, and every man hastened to his post.

The *dénouement* has a picturesque unexpectedness. While the good patriots of Brussels were taking their accustomed rest on the night of September 26 the Dutch quietly evacuated the dreaming town. No sentinel saw them go, no drowsy ear heard them. At dawn the citizens turned out as usual for the daily sniping, and it was not till several hours had passed that, surprised at the unnatural quiet which brooded over the Parc, a few scouts crept forward to reconnoitre. And, behold! the enemy camp was void.

The Belgians penetrated into the empty trenches, inspected the abandoned cannon, munitions and other war material. Their unwary feet tripped over the carcases of horses and the bodies of slain men, scarce hidden under an inch of soil and a scattering of dead leaves. The Dutch, indeed, showed scant respect for their dead; the seventy-four corpses found in the Parc were all naked.

> It would need a pen more eloquent than ours [writes a contemporary] to depict the aspect of Brussels on the morning of the 27th. More than 60,000 inhabitants who had been hidden for four days in the cellars of their dwellings came out to the light of day, and wandered everywhere, joy and triumph expressed in their countenances and gestures. Complete strangers embraced one another; people wept for happiness. They contemplated the ashes, the ruins, the devastation that lay around them, with looks in which grief, hatred and victory were blended. And everyone said to himself: '*It is dearly bought! But at least we shall no longer be Dutch.*'

The instinct of the people did not err. Mysterious as it may seem, these four September days had decided Belgium's future. The campaign in the provinces, the battles and siege of Antwerp, had not the smallest effect on the general situation. King William's complete capitulation, his promise of administrative separation and of the reform of the Fundamental Law, made public on September 29, the last desperate efforts of the Prince of Orange to recover his lost prestige—all this evoked nothing but contempt from the patriots, sure now of final victory.

> The 'Brussels Days' had been the prelude to the insurrection of the entire country [writes Monsieur Pirenne]. Horrified by the violence and the suddenness of the movement, the authorities allowed themselves to be deposed without protest. It was scarcely necessary to attack the *régime*; it was crumbling of itself.

On October 28 the Belgian patriot Rogier signed an 'indefinite armistice' with the Dutch general; the hostile armies withdrew into Holland; the war was over.

It is not within the scope of this article to retrace the ensuing diplomatic developments which culminated in the recognition by the Powers of the kingdom of Belgium, under the sceptre of Leopold I.

These retrospective meditations, begun in the Place St.

Michel, may fittingly end there. On September 25, in the thic of the battle of Brussels, d'Hoogvorst and his associates ha issued a proclamation commanding that a pit should be dug the Place St. Michel to receive the bodies of 'the brave defender of Liberty,' and promising that 'a monument shall transmit Posterity the names of the heroes and the country's gratitude. The dead were therefore carried down in long procession to th little old square, where by the raw grave priests knelt day an night in prayer.

And henceforth the spot was known as the Place des Martyr.

MARIE-LOUISE DE MEEÛS.

OVERSEA MECHANICAL ROAD TRANSPORT

It is not generally realised by people at home that lack of adequate transport facilities is one of the chief obstacles to the more rapid development of our oversea Empire. We have here a vicious circle: the Dominions want more settlers, but are afraid of the risk of swelling the number of their own unemployed in the cities, and all the time land in the country districts awaits development through lack of transport facilities. On the other hand, railways cannot be built to serve country districts until there are sufficient settlers to justify construction. In this connexion mechanical road transport offers a solution of the difficulty.

It might be argued that if railways were built in these vast and sparsely populated areas development would follow and eventually the railways would pay their way. This is true up to a certain point, and in some cases the policy would be justified, but in most cases there would not be sufficient traffic for years to come; no private capital could be attracted for the construction of such railways, and the State could not afford to finance them during an indefinite term of years.

For a full realisation of the problem it is necessary to compare the density of our population at home with that of some overseas countries. In Great Britain there are 395 people to the square mile, whilst in Australia the population density is two to the square mile; and, since most of these are concentrated in the coast cities, the country districts can claim only about one person to every square mile—surely a case of 'splendid isolation.' In these circumstances not only railways, but even good roads, are often an impossibility. In order to have as low a population density in the British Isles we must imagine our numbers reduced to 120,000 people—the population of one comparatively small town, like, say, Norwich, spread over the whole of these islands.

Brigadier-General F. D. Hammond, who is an authority on these matters, says that the loneliest farmer in England generally has at his door a road which most farmers in the oversea Empire would view with envy; also that the less fortunate settlers may have to transport their produce for days before reaching a railway. There are to-day in the Dominions and all

over the Colonial Empire zones of 'No Man's Land' which potential areas of production, but it is not worth anyone's w to cultivate them because of the difficulties of transport. T are too far from the railways, and prohibitive transport cha cut them off from the markets.

Transport by lorry at present costs at least 1*s*. 6*d*. per t mile, and transport by rail costs only about 2*d*. per ton-m What is wanted is something that would bridge the gap until s time as the settlement of a district would warrant the constr tion of a railway: the cost of railway construction varies fr 4000*l*. to 10,000*l*. per mile, so it is seen the capital expense i any case a formidable item. The economic radius of lorry tra port is not yet fully determined, and depends on the load that be carried on each journey. In tropical Africa parallel lines railway are placed roughly at 300 miles apart. With lorry tr port at 1*s*. 6*d*. per ton-mile, this involves a charge of 3*l*. 15*s*. ton for a journey of fifty miles to the railway. Up to that dista a lorry is economically possible, but for any further distance i out of the question except for high-priced crops such as cot and tobacco.

A special type of vehicle is required for overseas conditic where there are usually only bad roads or no roads at all. Bri manufacturers are endeavouring with some success to meet demand for the design of a vehicle intended for use as an auxili or feeder service for the railways. There are two uses to wh such a service might be put—either as a pioneer service a cipating the construction of a railway, or as a feeder service to existing railway, swelling the volume of traffic in much the sa way as the tributaries of a river increase the flow in the m stream. If large road units could be constructed with an econo radius of 100 miles from railway centres—and to do this the c per ton-mile would have to be reduced from the present figur 1*s*. 6*d*. to as low as 6*d*. or 4*d*.—then existing railways would able to tap an area two or three times as large as at present, a the volume of traffic would be greatly stimulated.

The two most suitable types that have emerged from vehi designed for the purpose described are the six-wheel lorry a the caterpillar track machine, the latter sometimes fitted wit Kegresse or rubber-band track. The latest pattern of this is half-track type, with the track covering the two rear axles o The principal problem yet to be solved, however, is how to incre load-carrying capacity without increasing axle load, and for reason a road train with suitably designed trailers is now find favour with the experts.

A year ago an Oversea Mechanical Transport Directing C mittee was appointed by Mr. Amery—at that time Secretary

State for Dominion Affairs and the Colonies—to study every aspect of mechanical transport likely to further the economic development of the oversea Empire. One of the primary objects of this Committee has been the development of a large transport unit not confined solely to good roads. Half the expenses of the Committee, estimated at 120,000*l.* to be spread over a period of five years, are to be borne by the Empire Marketing Board and half by the oversea Governments concerned. It is proposed ultimately to set up an Overseas Mechanical Transport Committee composed of representatives of His Majesty's Government, the Colonial Empire, and the Governments of the Dominions, India, and the Sudan. Meanwhile the present Committee has been appointed in order that the work may be started promptly, as the question is rightly considered urgent.

In order to determine on the best type of vehicle for overseas road transport the Committee has conferred with the War Office, leading manufacturers, and officials of roads, railways, and engineering departments of the oversea Governments. They welcome suggestions and criticism from all interested parties and from anyone competent to appreciate the problems involved.

Up to the present the only report issued by the Committee is a confidential one, but it is understood the trend of their activities so far has been chiefly in the direction of discovering how far the cost per ton-mile of motor transport can be reduced by handling heavier loads. They have accordingly arranged for the design of two road units—one to handle a useful load of about fifteen tons, and the other a useful load of about forty tons. Both units will consist of a tractor and a number of trailers so as to spread the load, and the axle load will not exceed three tons. The smaller unit will be of the rigid six-wheel type favoured by the War Office, and which has already proved its suitability for oversea conditions: the larger unit will be a Kegresse track machine. The Committee have also an eight-wheel trailer undergoing tests; it is fitted with automatic steering and braking mechanism, and carries a useful load of seven and a half tons. Several of these will be used to form a road train.

Other problems which the Committee are pledged to tackle are those connected with finding some fuel cheaper than and equally as satisfactory as petrol. The price of petrol in many parts of the Empire varies from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.* 6*d.* a gallon, according to the distance from the coast and the difficulties of transport. Several substitutes for petrol have been suggested and even tried experimentally, with promising success. With a slight alteration to the carburettor alcohol can be successfully used on engines designed for petrol consumption. It has already been made and sold as a substitute for petrol in Natal and Uganda and

some parts of Australia, being produced as a by-product in th manufacture of sugar, but it can also be produced from man other crops which might be cultivated specially for the purpose In some places it offers a distinct saving in price over petrol, bu even so its price runs to about 2s. a gallon. Moreover, it shoul be noted that, in view of the strenuous conditions that are ofte encountered in undeveloped countries, the makers of petro engines do not recommend anything but the best motor spiri for their engines.

Another type of fuel which promises greater success is pro ducer gas. This reduces the cost of fuel to about one-fifteentl that of petrol. The gas is produced from charcoal, which easily obtainable in any wooded country. The engine, however has to be specially constructed for its use, and the bulky apparatu carried on the car is also a disadvantage. It is said the system gives good results under skilled direction, but not when it operation and maintenance are left to the ordinary lorry driver Other authorities who have experimented with it, however, are satisfied that it is a practicable system which does not requir specially skilled attention.

Steam power is to be recommended where there is a supply coal or good hard wood or charcoal available. Depôts for thi might be established along the line of route.

Another alternative to petrol, and one that promises the mos universal success of all, is the Diesel engine using heavy oil. Thi will probably be found to be the most powerful factor yet intro duced to solve the fuel problem. The Oversea Mechanical Trans port Directing Committee are of opinion that Diesel engines suit able for a fifteen-ton unit are already on the market, and tha one suitable for a forty to fifty-ton unit will be available shortly

A problem of minor importance concerns more particularly the tyre manufacturers. Balloon tyres have been found most suitable on unmade roads as giving a larger bearing surface, and the task before British tyre manufacturers is therefore to perfect a tyre of this description so that it will stand up to extremes o temperature, actinic rays, and abrasions from tree stumps and hard ruts baked by the tropical sun.

Now let us briefly summarise what has been accomplished in some parts of the Empire by making use of this new factor in transport. Australia and South Africa are the two Dominions likely to reap most benefit from it on account of their population being scattered over such wide and undeveloped areas.

The essential problem in the transport system of Australia, as of all other parts of the Empire, is how to reduce the ton-mile cost. To take one instance only of the potential advantages of cheap and adequate transport, it is estimated the wheat area of Australia

could be trebled if the necessary transport were available. The continent of Australia covers an area of nearly 3,000,000 square miles (more than twenty-five times the area of Great Britain), with only 6,000,000 inhabitants. The railways are owned by the different States or by the Commonwealth Government, and are being steadily extended to meet increasing demands. Although it has been responsible for the piling up of a heavy burden of debt, railway development is still inadequate to the pressing transport needs of Australia. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that both the State and Commonwealth Governments are interested in the saving in cost of railway construction that may be effected by proper use of road services. Parallel railways can thereby be placed wider apart and made to serve a greater area.

The Federal Government has made a grant of 20,000,000*l.* for road construction, to be spread over ten years; this is in addition to the usual amounts allocated for the purpose by the various States' Governments. It is worthy of note here that Australia and Canada share the distinction of having per 1000 of population the longest mileage of railway track of any country in the world, but Australia bears the sole distinction of having the lowest mileage track per 1000 square miles, so it is seen Australia's transport problems are, in a sense, unique.

Lorries have not yet to any great extent replaced horse or bullock teams for hauling heavy loads of wool, etc. The cost per ton-mile by horse teams in back-country districts is from 10*d.* to 1*s.* 6*d.*, according to road conditions. Mechanical transport has so far not been able to compete in price with this. The advent of the six-wheeler is being watched with interest, and a limited number are already in use; they appear admirably suited to Australian conditions. The development of the track vehicle is also being closely watched, but the possibility of these and their economic radius has not yet been tried in Australia on any large scale. The fuel problem affects Australia more acutely than most parts of the Empire because the price of petrol is abnormally high. The hope of finding a natural supply of oil on the continent has up to the present not been realised, although there are promising indications of oil in several districts. The supply of synthetic oil and petrol produced from coal has also been considered, but the difficulty of disposing of the by-products among the limited population of Australia would probably make this a non-paying proposition.

In South Africa, in the country districts, there are many road services operated by the State Railways, the management having wisely decided to work up traffic in this way in advance of railway construction. In some cases the road services have had to be abandoned owing to lack of support; in other cases the volume

of traffic has justified replacing the road service with way.

In his report for 1928 the general manager of the State ways for the Union of South Africa says that from the of view of rapid expansion the road motor transport s inaugurated by the railways in country districts stand out spicuously, and there is abundant evidence to justify the that this enterprise will play a most important part in the f economic development of the Union—a part almost as imp as the railways themselves.

At the close of the 1924–25 financial period only eight se were being operated by the railways. Twelve months late nineteeen districts being served with a total route mileage miles. By March 31, 1927, the mileage had reached 4282 and a year later it was 7349 miles. It is safe to prophesy th total mileage of road services in the Union of South Afric soon exceed that of the railways, which at present stands at 12,000 miles. The total number of vehicles operating at Mar 1928, was 240, an increase of 109 vehicles during the year. operation of the road services last year resulted in a loss of 11, but this is a small sum if the great advantages to the comm and the more rapid development of the country be taker account.

In an article in *Modern Transport*, Sir John Thorn relates some of the impressions he gained during a recent in South Africa. He gives an interesting example o advantages of road transport for pioneer services: a b railway line was demanded in a certain district and c surveys and estimates prepared. The estimated cost was 750 and the time of construction three years. It was also estir there would be a loss on the first year's working of 40,000 these circumstances it was decided to try a road service, took only a few months to instal at a capital outlay of 27, and showed a profit at once.

The roads in South Africa are mostly dirt tracks, and greatly according to the country to be traversed. Six- vehicles with large pneumatic tyres do not, as a rule, cause damage to the surface: experience seems to indicate that the ground is not broken up in the first instance, or cut channels by heavy rainstorms, a very considerable traffi be carried on a sandy soil. Goods are consigned at through by rail and road to any point in the Union to which the sy extends. Some of the road services cover comparatively distances, but others extend to points over 200 miles fror railways. What may be called 'seasonal' traffic is easily ha by putting additional trucks into the service, or tractors w

number of trailers forming a road train, and withdrawing these when the demand for them ceases. This is the plan adopted at the season of the year when crops are marketed, especially in those districts where citrous fruit is grown.

In Canada not much experimental work has been done in connexion with long-distance road transport. The reason for this may be found in the fact that railway development had reached an advanced stage before the advent of suitable road vehicles. Canada, being a near neighbour of the United States of America, has tried to emulate that country in the matter of railway development, sometimes too intensively. Being dazzled by the success of the C.P.R., an ambitious railway programme of construction has been carried out which has not always been justified : in consequence Canada has often been bled nearly white by having to finance this construction and pay for initial losses on working expenses. Another cause of the lack of interest in road transport in the Dominion is the profusion of large lakes and navigable rivers that intersect the country : even where the rivers are not strictly navigable they generally suffice for the transport of logs, logging being a pioneer industry in all except the Prairie Provinces.

During the winter months, however, the frozen lakes and rivers form valuable potential highways, and Government engineers have carried out extensive experiments to determine the best type of vehicle suitable for ice transport. It seems obvious to an outside observer that there is a large field for the profitable use of road and ice transport, in co-operation with the railways, in augmenting their traffic and opening up new districts, and that any time or money spent on developing and organising road services would not be wasted.

Some other parts of the Empire where mechanical road transport gives promise of great success are New Zealand, Rhodesia, India, Irak, Kenya, and the Sudan.

A memorandum presented at the Colonial Office Conference of 1927 by the Mechanical Transport Sub-Committee of the Empire Cotton Growers Corporation may here be briefly summarised, as it gives valuable information regarding transport problems in potential cotton-growing areas in tropical Africa :

Large areas suitable for cotton growing are at present inaccessible owing to lack of transport. There should be main feeders to the railways and minor feeders to the main feeders. The former should be capable of carrying produce at a much lower rate than the existing three-ton lorry, and should have an economic range of 100 to 150 miles, for low-priced rotation crops as well as for cotton. Transportation for the minor feeders exists in Africa in the form of head-porterage, which is not economical for distances

greater than two or three miles, and ox and mule waggons or pack animals, which can only be used in certain districts free from tsetse fly, and in any case do great damage to the roads. The best form of transport for these minor feeders is undoubtedly light motor lorries. Although these are often used on what ought to be main feeder routes for distances up to 200 miles, their economic radius is not more than 50 miles.

The damage done to a road by a vehicle depends primarily on the surface pressure of the tyre or track, and secondly on the speed. The pressure should be kept down to 25 lb. per square inch and the speed regulated to a maximum of 15 miles per hour. The cost of even a dirt road in tropical Africa may be as high a 2000*l*. per mile if a number of culverts and bridges are required; and the annual upkeep may be reckoned at a minimum of 100*l*. per mile. Paved fords or submerged viaducts across rivers are recommended by some authorities in preference to bridges as being cheaper both in first cost and in maintenance. Stress is laid upon the desirability of roads and transport being under one executive.

From the above it would seem that the transport problem in tropical Africa is as much one of efficient organisation as of finding the most suitable type of vehicle. In the latter connexion, it should be noted, the Committee favour the use of suction gas as a substitute for petrol, because there is always available a plentiful supply of native-made charcoal, which is very suitable for producing the gas. They also allude to the fact that forty tons carried by a fleet of three-ton lorries would require a personnel of about a dozen men, whereas the same load carried by road train would require only two men, besides saving in engine power and consequently in fuel.

It may be stated with confidence that for machines best suited for road transport in undeveloped countries British manufacturers have obtained a distinct lead. Among the principal firms specialising in six-wheel trucks and track motor vehicles may be mentioned Messrs. Thornycroft, Messrs. Crossley, and the F.W.D. (Four-Wheel Drive) Motor Company. Thornycroft six-wheelers may be met with in successful operation in all four corners of the Empire. Messrs. Crossley have of late years concentrated on the rigid six-wheel chassis, with articulated rear axles, which, they say, has been generally adopted by the British and oversea Governments in preference to the Kegresse track type, over which it possesses many advantages, such as lower initial cost, greater speed, and lower average fuel costs. On soft ground it can be fitted with over-all tracks on the rear wheels. The articulation enables one pair of the rear wheels to be inclined at an opposite angle to the other pair, and thus uneven ground

[illegible]

can be negotiated without tilting the chassis. The F.W.D. Motor Company claim for their vehicles that they give excellent service on good roads as well as in cross-country use. The driving power on the front wheels helps steering over bad roads or soft ground, increases the draw-bar pull, and makes the vehicle more suitable for cross-country work. On good roads the front-axle drive may be disengaged by the driver. The Sentinel Steam Waggon Company formerly made a roadless steam tractor for cross-country use, but state they have been obliged to cease manufacturing this vehicle because it was found the cost of track replacements made it an uneconomic proposition. Their eight to ten-ton steam lorries, however, fitted with solid tyres for service on metalled roads, have gained a world-wide reputation, and should be suitable for dirt roads and oversea conditions if fitted with twin or balloon type pneumatic tyres.

Wherever any noteworthy progress has been made in road transport overseas it is found to be through co-operation, and not competition between road and rail. The success of such co-operation in South Africa should stimulate the other Dominions to increased efforts in this direction. It shows, too, the advantages to be derived by railways operating their own road services; they are in the best position to serve the public efficiently, having greater resources at their back and a ready-prepared organisation.

By co-ordination of transport systems and a full use of road services intelligently applied this new factor in transport is likely to play a leading part in the future development of the Empire.

R. E. TURNBULL.

THE DAWN OF MINING

THE oldest known tools and mines have been found in Eas Anglia, far from any of the areas probable as the original home man: so fragmentary is our knowledge of primitive man! Th earliest known mines were worked for flint at Brandon, in Suffolk and their antiquity has been greatly increased by their identifica tion by Mr. Reginald Smith [1] as belonging to the Older instea of to the Newer Stone Age.

Modern civilisation depends on metals, and no great advanc was possible while the only materials for tools were stone, wood and bone. The foundation of industrial progress dates from th dawn of metal-working, and the determination of its site is problem of perennial interest. There has been long controvers on this question between the archæologists, who rely on the relic left by early man, and the metallurgists, who are guided by th conditions that control the preparation and preservation of metals The archæologists place the Bronze Age before the Iron Age, as i so many places bronze weapons are found in beds earlier tha those containing iron; and it has been held that iron-workin requires higher temperatures and skill than the preparation o copper and bronze. The metallurgist, on the other hand, explain the absence or rarity of early iron relics by the readiness wit which iron rusts entirely away; and he points out that th preparation of iron requires a lower temperature than the extrac tion of copper from its ores, and is a much simpler process tha the manufacture of bronze. The ores of iron are the most widel distributed, and its extraction from them is so simple a chemica process that it must have happened constantly in camp fire The preparation of iron should therefore have preceded that o the more complex metal bronze.

Archæologists have generally held that iron-working, excep occasionally from meteorites, began about 1000 B.C., and wa little practised in Europe before about 700 B.C. That meteorite were the first source of iron is improbable, for the iron meteorite quickly decay and disappear in a moist atmosphere, and the would have lasted but a short time in the river valleys or on th

[1] *Archæologia*, ser. 2, vol. xiii., 1912, pp. 109–158.

localities that were probably the home of the first metal-workers. Iron meteorites would have lasted longer in the deserts, but the conditions there would not have been favourable to the development of iron manufacture. Iron has been made from meteorites by primitive people, such as the Eskimo; but such iron can be recognised by its high percentage of nickel.

In recent years there has been widening recognition that the first metal tools were probably made of iron. Its antiquity has been pushed back from the dates of the Hallstatt Iron Age in Central Europe of 700 B.C. to the Homeric period in Greece and the Ægean of 1000 to 800 B.C., to 1100 B.C. in Etruria and northern Italy, 1200 B.C. in Crete, 1000 B.C. in southern India, and 1500 B.C. in the Punjab. Even earlier dates have become necessary since the discovery at Ur of specialised iron tools which are assigned to 3500 B.C. Pre-dynastic iron beads, which have been regarded as dating from 6000 B.C., had been previously discovered in Egypt: but, in the absence of evidence as to their chemical composition, they had been explained as curiosities made from meteorites; and the same origin has been suggested for the iron wedge found in the Great Pyramid of Gizeh (fourth dynasty: 3733 B.C.), which is earlier than any known iron in Mesopotamia.

The original home of iron-working is generally assigned either to eastern Asia Minor [1] or tropical Africa. South of the Caucasus, in Georgia and northern Armenia, iron slags are widespread through a tract of country extending far eastward from Batum on the Black Sea; and then further south another line occurs in the Taurus Mountains between Aleppo and the Euphrates. The ironworks in these localities may have supplied iron to Chaldea and Assyria, including the 150 tons of iron and iron implements found at Khorsabad at the temple of Sargon. This hoard was much later than the earliest iron tools of Ur, and for their material it seems unnecessary to go so far away as either the Taurus or the Caucasus.

The credit of the original invention of iron-working may belong to the negro race. Its ancient slag heaps show that the extraction of iron in a primitive type of furnace had been widespread and long-continued in tropical Africa. The age of these slag heaps is still undetermined; but direct evidence of the early date of iron-working in Africa is supplied from ancient Egypt. The oldest known iron is in the pre-dynastic beads, the wedge found in the Great Pyramid (3733 B.C.), and a piece of an iron pick from Abusir, which dates from the fifth dynasty, at about 3566 B.C. According to Sir Flinders Petrie, however, these dates

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, W. Gowland, 'The Metals in Antiquity,' *Journ. R. Anthrop. Instit.*, vol. xlii., 1912, p. 281; H. Louis, Presidential Address, *Journ. Iron and Steel Instit.*, vol. cxix., 1929, p. 30.

should be much earlier. That this ancient iron reached Egypt from the south is suggested by the discovery in Nubia of an iron sickle and spearhead of the twelfth dynasty, assigned to 2466 B.C.

That iron-working in Egypt was introduced by the negro is indicated by a bas-relief of about 1500 B.C., now in Florence, which shows an unmistakable negro working the bellows of a primitive African type of iron furnace.

As the formation of grains and flakes of metallic iron, which could be welded into useful pieces, must have happened in many parts of the world when men prepared stone fireplaces, the use of iron may have started independently in various places. The balance between the claims for priority of Asia Minor and Africa is still uncertain, but the evidence seems in favour of Africa.

The scarcity of iron among the relics of ancient Egypt raises doubt whether iron was extensively used there; but the same consideration arises with bronze. Much of the Egyptian stone cutting and carving was clearly done by metal tools, and, as they have been found so rarely, it is more probable that they were of the evanescent iron rather than of the more durable bronze.

The iron tools found at Ur prove that iron-working was highly developed in 3500 B.C., and must date back before the main Bronze Age.[3] But on the discovery of bronze its many advantages made it for a couple of millenniums the more widely used metal.

The use of bronze followed that of copper, which may have been the first metal used for domestic utensils. Native copper occurs in many parts of the world in lumps, plates, and fibres. It is easily hammered into sheets, which can be bent into cooking-pots and water-vessels, or it can be drawn into wire. Pure copper is too soft for tools and weapons, but the early smelters must often have obtained it hardened by an accidental alloy. Copper ores often contain antimony, and the metal made from them would, as in Hungary, have been hardened by the presence of 4 to 5 per cent. of antimony. Some early copper has been improved for use as tools by the similarly undesigned intermixture of bismuth. The most useful of the copper compounds is bronze. The smelting of copper ore in the presence of some tin ore produces the copper-tin alloy bronze, which is a highly serviceable metal. Its useful qualities doubtless led to the search for tin, of which the main supply to the Mediterranean countries was obtained in Cornwall, supplemented by north-western Spain and

[3] The date of the beginning of the Bronze Age is given for various places as ranging from 3000–2500 B.C. by Gowland (*Journ. R. Anthrop. Inst.*, vol. xlii., pp. 245–247).

[illegible]. The Phœnicians were the early tin merchants; and [illegible] they drew supplies from Cornwall is shown by a large [illegible]haped tin ingot, with a stamp upon it that has been identified Phœnician, that was dredged in Falmouth Harbour. Its [illegible]ape is depicted in the fresco by Lord Leighton, in the Royal [illegible]change, London, of the Phœnicians trading with the ancient [illegible]itons. This ingot was ingeniously designed for horse transport the journey across the south of England and France, and to flat on the floor of the boats that carried it over the Strait of [illegible]ver and from Marseilles to the Levant.

Copper was obtained from many localities along the Mediter[illegible]nean; it was probably first worked extensively in Cyprus, [illegible]ence it derived its name. It was mined by the ancient Egyp[illegible]ns in Sinai; the Sumerians of Ur worked it and other metals southern Cappadocia, as clay tablets with the name of Ibil Sin, 2350 B.C., have been found in the mines there,[4] and the seals Gudea, of about 2800 B.C., have been found in mines behind [illegible]ebizond on the Black Sea. The Phœnicians, and later the [illegible]mans, obtained a large part of their supply from southern [illegible]ain, from masses of iron pyrites that still maintain great mines Rio Tinto and Tharsis.

Gold was probably the first metal used by man. Grains of [illegible]ccur in the sands of many rivers, and must have attracted his [illegible]ention by their brilliant colour when he set his fish-traps. As [illegible] grains are easily beaten into plates and wire, they could be [illegible]ade into rings and beads. Gold was of no use for weapons of [illegible]r or of the chase, and was accordingly despised by men of [illegible] Stone Age. It was valued later for decorative purposes, and archæological interest is due to its clues as to early trad [illegible]utes.

Gold in small quantities is widely distributed through the [illegible]ier rocks. Its abundance in the river gravels of the south-east Ireland made that area the centre of the gold industry of the [illegible]itish Isles and Scandinavia. Ornaments were made from gold many parts of the world from local supplies; but it was used Egypt and Mesopotamia on a scale that required extensive and [illegible]illed mining in one of the world's major goldfields. The [illegible]ntities used in Egypt and Chaldea were enormous. The [illegible]ssive coffin of Tutankhamen is of solid gold, which was then plentiful that the undertakers of his time were prodigal in its [illegible]. Thotmes III. (1479 B.C.) went to war in a chariot of gold [illegible]mbined with some silver. Gold was for long worth much less [illegible]n its weight of silver or copper.

In Babylon also gold was a common metal. Herodotus and [illegible]dorus both described the profusion of gold in the Temple of

[4] Waddell, *Makers of Civilization*, 1929, p. 402.

Bel in Babylon, with golden statues, one of which was 40 high, and a golden table 40 feet long and 15 feet wide. We k from Genesis (xiii. 2) that Abram was rich in gold and silver; Mr. Gadd, of the British Museum, describes the people of U enjoying an amazing 'riot of gold.'[5]

It is natural to turn first for the source of the gold of E to the goldfields of Libya and Nubia, in the mountains wes the Red Sea, and for the gold of Ur to the localities where gol recorded on the upper Euphrates, in Asia Minor or nortl Persia.

Classical legends indicate that Asia Minor yielded gold quantities which for those days were large. The fabulous wea of Crœsus came from the mines near Smyrna; the story of Mi and his golden touch suggests the existence of a plentiful sou of gold in Phrygia in the north-west of Asia Minor: that river beds of the north-eastern provinces yielded gold is sho by the expedition of the Argonauts to Colchis, and Jason's of the golden fleece indicates that the adhesion of meta particles to a greasy surface was then known. Modern experie shows that though gold occurs in many localities in Asia Mi and northern Persia, the quantities are small. The mines, e when worked with the cheap labour and infinite patience of ancients, could hardly have supplied enough for 40-foot stat and the abundant jewellery of the courtiers of Ur.

The ancient Egyptians certainly worked the goldmines Libya, Nubia, and Midian. That they mined extensively persistently is shown by the extent of the disturbed gravels by records of expeditions from that of Ameni, who brought b gold ore from Coptos in the twelfth dynasty (2466 B.C.),[6] to mining on the goldfield of Allagi, south-east of Wadi Halfa 1900 B.C. by Amenemhet III.,[7] and of the barbarous severity the mining work as described in a famous passage in Diodo (about 50 B.C.).

The mining-fields were rediscovered in the last century visited by an unsuccessful expedition sent by Mehemet Ali un Linant de Bellefonds. The concession in 1896 of some mines w of the Red Sea to Theodore Bent and Rider Haggard also p duced no gold. But from 1899 to 1920 the ancient mining ar were searched by expert miners. According to the official rep by the Egyptian Mines Department, in 1922 only one of mines had yielded a profit, and the results show that the g majority of the deposits known to have been worked by ancients are small and patchy.

[5] *History and Monuments of Ur*, 1929, p. 27.

[6] H.H. Manchester, *Eng. and Min. Journ. Press*, vol. cxiv., 1922, p. 411.

[7] T. A. Rickard, 'Copper and Gold Mines of the Ancient Egyptians,' *i* vol. cxix., 1925, p. 1008.

The experience of modern Egyptian gold-mining between 00-1920 shows that the early Egyptians must have had some ther source of supply, or gold would not have been described as eing as common as dust.

That the gold of Egypt and Mesopotamia may have come om Central Asia is suggested by two considerations. The people Ur and Egypt both used the blue gem lapis lazuli, and it no oubt came from Badakshan, the north-eastern province of fghanistan. This mineral is also found near Lake Baikal, but includes there some coloured varieties that have not been found Ur or Egypt. Moreover, if the lapis lazuli of Ur had come om Lake Baikal, jade would probably also have been found mong the agates and cornelians so largely used in Babylonia. urther evidence of intercourse between Chaldea and Central sia is afforded by the huge Tibetan dogs which are unmistak-bly depicted on a terra-cotta tablet from Babylon. Ctesias, the reek authority on the commercial geography of Asia in the fth century B.C., expressly stated that the gold of Babylon came om the East across Persia. It may have been part of the gold hich, according to Herodotus and other classical authors, was ised by gold-digging ants. The most plausible interpretation of iis story is that the Tibetans mined gold in the winter, during iich they lived underground in their excavations, like the orkers in the silver mines of Laurium in Greece that were opened the Phœnicians in the fifth century B.C.[8] Traders from India sited the mining-fields, and found the miners dressed in yak ins, sometimes with the horns attached. Hence rose the report iat these ants were covered with fur and had horns. Nearchus, ie of the officers of Alexander the Great, said he had actually en one of the skins of these gold-digging animals, and, according Pliny, a specimen in the Temple of Hercules in Erythræ, near myrna, was horned. The Indian traders apparently sometimes ole the gold or gold ore and were then chased by the diggers id their huge mastiffs. According to the story, only female imels which had dropped their young just before starting on the pedition and were eager to get back to their calves could aintain their pace for a sufficient time to make good their cape.

This legend indicates that Tibet yielded some of the gold iat reached south-western Asia; but there is no evidence that iy of the goldfields in Central Asia were worked on a sufficient ale to have supplied the quantity of gold owned by the people Ur.

[8] C. L. Sagui, 'The Ancient Mining Works of Cassandra, Greece,' *Econ. ol.*, vol. xxiii., 1928, p. 675; and Edouard Ardaillon, *Les Mines du Laurion ns l'Antiquité*, 1897, p. 126.

The goldfields of Mysore, in southern India, and of Singhbhum, to the west of Bengal, were both worked in prehistoric times. The workings in Mysore were 300 feet deep, but the date is uncertain. The produce of both fields was probably retained in India. The ancient Sumerian towns of the Indus valley were less well supplied with gold than Chaldea. Hence it is unlikely that the gold of eastern and southern India went to Chaldea through the settlements on the Lower Indus.

Rhodesia is the one rich mining-field known to have had ancient workings on a scale large enough to have provided the quantities of gold held in Egypt and Mesopotamia. The amount of ore removed from the ancient workings in Southern Rhodesia has been estimated as 100,000,000 tons. If so, as the material worked would hardly have contained less than half an ounce of gold to the ton, 200,000,000*l.* worth of gold would have been won from the ancient mines. The estimate of 75,000,000 tons by Telford Edwards was made while many of the old workings were unknown.

This gold did not stay in South Africa, or more gold objects would have been found there. If the Portuguese, after their settlement, had obtained gold on that scale, the history of Portuguese East Africa would have been very different. The Arabs no doubt obtained some during their ten centuries' occupation of the coast; but their jewellery is mostly of silver, and the relative scarcity of gold in Arabia shows that there was no great inflow of gold in mediæval times.

Mr. L. Woolley [9] quotes the bill of lading of a ship that returned to the Persian Gulf in 2048 B.C. after an absence of two years, laden with gold, copper ore, and ivory; and the fleet of Solomon's partner, Hiram of Tyre, returned to its base at the head of the Red Sea after voyages of three years, bringing gold, silver, ivory, and apes.

Hence contemporary records prove that some southern goldfield, accessible by sea from the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, supplied at least part of the gold and copper that was used in Mesopotamia and Palestine. This goldfield was probably that of Rhodesia, unless there be clear evidence that the mining there was much later than the golden age of Egypt, Chaldea, and Palestine.

The age of the prehistoric mining in Rhodesia has been again raised by Miss G. Caton-Thompson's recent excavations at Zimbabwe and other ruins. She claims that her work confirms the conclusions of Professor Randall Maciver after his diggings in 1905. She goes further, for, while he regarded the mining as connected with the Arab settlement on the East African coast,

[9] *Sumerians*, 1928, p. 116.

she declares it inconceivable how any theory of a Semitic origin of the Rhodesian ruins could ever have been started.[10]

The buildings were examined by Mauch, Schlichter, and Theodore Bent, who, with others, claimed that the architecture, ornamentation, bird-capped pillars, the metallurgical processes, the shape of the ingots, and the narrowness of the mining spaces all indicate that the buildings and mining were due directly or indirectly to an early Semitic people from south-western Asia.

The late Dr. Percy Wagner considers [11] that the same people opened the copper-mines of Northern Rhodesia and Katanga, of which the antiquity is shown by, amongst other evidence, the famous Rhodesian skull. Was its owner mediæval?

The careful excavations by Professor Maciver and Miss Caton-Thompson did not, however, discover any objects which they regard as ancient or due to extraneous influence. The objects found at Zimbabwe they regard as Bantu; whereas some experts on African anthropology, such as the late Sir H. H. Johnston, describe many of them as 'utterly unlike anything that has been ever made by any race of Bantu negroes.'

Negative evidence on ancient sites has to be regarded with caution. With the exception of one tin ingot, which by a fortunate mishap was sunk in Falmouth Harbour, apparently no Phœnician or Greek object coin or inscription has ever been found in Cornwall. Yet it appears to be universally admitted that the early working of the Cornish tin was for the Phœnician market. We were once asked to believe that the date of Stonehenge, from precise measurements and observations, the absence of bronze, and the occurrence of Roman glass and iron objects, and from fragments of Roman titles having been raked from under the stones, was 740 A.D. ± 200 years, though 'perhaps as early as 400 A.D.,' or else that it had grown up in six stages, beginning with pre-Roman earthworks and ending with the erection of the inner stones as tombstones in post-Roman times.[12]

That the imitative Bantu of Rhodesia continued until modern times to build stone walls and carve soapstone in imitation of ancient models is highly probable; but the recent age of the crude soapstone objects and most of the ruins does not disprove the antiquity of the more skilfully made models and buildings.

Chaldea and Egypt in ancient times received a vast quantity of gold from some unknown source, and some at least of it was brought by sea from a long voyage to the south. South Africa sent a vast quantity of gold to some unknown destination. Hence, even apart from the testimony of authorities who have

[10] *Nature*, October 19, 1929, p. 619.
[11] *Cf. Nature*, September 28, 1929, p. 493.
[12] W. M. F. Petrie, *Stonehenge*, 1880, pp. 20, 27, 30, 32–34.

regarded many of the objects discovered in the Rhodesian ruins as evidence of Semitic influence, the early history of mining strongly supports the conclusion that the rich outcrop mines of Rhodesia rendered gold the commonest decorative metal in ancient Egypt and Babylonia.

J. W. GREGORY.

COMMERCIAL VEGETABLE CULTURE

ɪᴇ commercial culture of vegetables in England goes back to ·ly times. In the twenty-second year of his reign Charles II. anted a charter to William, Earl of Bedford to hold and keep market within the parish of St. Paul, Covent Garden, 'for the ɪying and selling of all manner of fruits, flowers, roots and herbs ɪatsoever.'

In 1828 was passed the first Act of Parliament regulating ɪvent Garden Market. In 1824 the municipality of Birmingham mmenced the building of Smithfield Market to accommodate ɜ market which had grown up around the Bull Ring and had come a nuisance there. The charter of Charles II. is evidence at there was some commerce in vegetables in the seventeenth ntury, but it was the Industrial Revolution which, by leading creasing numbers of the rapidly growing population to quit ɜ villages for the towns, and thus divorcing them from a mestic supply of vegetables, created a demand for commercial pplies.

What became known as 'market gardens' grew up near ɪndon—along the Thames Valley, in Kent, on the southern rders of Hertfordshire, and on the western borders of Essex. · the outskirts of provincial towns the same movement took ·ce; thus near Bristol the Fishponds area developed; the allasey Island, near Liverpool; and Morpeth became the source supply for Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the towns about the rthern coalfields. Even around modern towns like Southend d Bournemouth we find this growth of local market rdens.

The radius of transport, limited to what a horse could do in day, prevented the industry spreading beyond the fringe of ban development. The advent of railways, however, made it ssible for areas where the soil was suitable to vegetable cultiva- ɪn, but not attached to any particular large urban centre, to be ought in. Thus the old abbey lands of Evesham, the sandy ıms of Bedfordshire and the area of millstone grit at Melbourne, Derbyshire, became centres of vegetable production. Railways ɪo made possible the growing of broccoli and early potatoes in

Cornwall, the extensive tracts devoted to celery, potatoes other vegetables on the silts and fenlands of Lincolnshire, Ca bridgeshire and Norfolk, and the limestone area of the Gow Peninsula in South Wales. The rapid expansion of cities towns in recent years has driven the cultivators of land, rende supremely fertile by generations of tillers, farther afield to be the process over again. At the beginning of the nineteen century there were market gardens bordering on the Vauxh Bridge Road, the produce of which was conveyed to Cov Garden Market in wheelbarrows. Almost within living memo in the neighbourhood of Clapham Junction Station there w market gardens, and quite within living memory in Fulha 'fields' cauliflowers and lettuces were produced for delivery, n only to London, but to the Midlands and the North of Englar Similarly, the growth of Birkenhead is absorbing the land Wallasey once reclaimed from the sea by cultivators at gr expenditure of labour and money, giving rise to an industry vegetable culture that supplied Liverpool and Birkenhea Birmingham, too, has submerged under bricks and mortar t lands from which it once derived supplies of vegetables.

The improvement in means of transport, the results of scienti research, and the increasing demand of a swelling populati have completely changed the character, conduct, and localiti of the industry. Vegetable crops once grown in little patch by gardeners are now produced in broad stretches on farm lan formerly devoted to the growth of cereals. The deepening clo of depression which envelops agriculture seems as if it may sh out the light of hope of any future in corn growing. 'Mark garden,' a term that has always defied definition, has now lo what significance it ever had. There are farms and there a small holdings.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century Huguenots fro France settled in Bermondsey and Wandsworth. They broug over a system of culture especially suitable to the growi of salad vegetables, and others that ordinarily would pa for intensive cultivation. The system, or modifications of i spread, and became characteristic of the culture in Walha Green, Fulham, and out along the Thames Valley to Chiswi and Brentford on one side and to Putney and Barnes on tl other.

The cheapening and improvement in the production of gla particularly developed in Belgium, together with the growi refinement in taste, an increase in wealth, and the deman arising from greater spending power in large numbers of t population, led to the beginnings of cultivation under glas houses about the middle of the nineteenth century. The ma

who, about eighty years ago, constructed the first glasshouse 200 feet long was looked upon as a madman. If the house could be filled with produce, it was said, such produce could never find a market. From the tiniest beginnings great installations of glasshouses gradually began to cover the land on both sides of the River Lea, some such installations extending to 30 acres covered by glass. It is possible to see still standing the now crazy structure covering a few square yards which was the nucleus around which glasshouses of modern construction—in some cases one house covering an acre—have grown. The sunny climate of Worthing and its sheltered position, nestling under the South Downs, attracted other pioneers of the industry and led to the growth of another concentration of the glasshouse section, second only to that in the Lea Valley. Glasshouse growers are now scattered over the country: at Basingstoke, at Hampton (Middlesex), at Langley, in Buckinghamshire, in Cheshire, and as far north as Northumberland there are important branches. Vegetables do not, of course, constitute the sole product, though tomatoes, cucumbers, beans, and mushrooms are all important crops. The following statistics show the importance which this department of agriculture has attained.

In 1925, when the last census of production was taken, the yield of tomatoes in England and Wales was estimated at about 47,000 tons, valued at 2,350,000*l*; 50,000,000 cucumbers were produced, valued at 750,000*l*., and 1,500,000 lbs. of grapes, valued at 130,000*l*. Other fruits and vegetables produced under glass were valued at 250,000*l*. The estimated total value of flowers grown under glass was about 1,350,000*l*. Roughly, 18,000 workers are regularly employed in glasshouses in England and Wales.

A series of articles appearing in a daily newspaper led to a boom in what is called 'French gardening.' This consists of very intensive methods of culture involving a liberal use of straw manure, both as a supplier of heat and a source of fertility, with glazed lights and frames and glass cloches for protection from weather. Many such gardens were started. With most of them the chief source of revenue was the 'taking in' of pupils. Few of these gardens now survive. It was soon found that the climate of England imposed modifications of method, and the superior standard of life enjoyed by workers here demanded larger margins than those endured by the French *maraîcher*, who, with the members of his family, is content to work long days and seven-day working weeks, and to expend amazing skill in order to wring a pittance from perhaps half an acre of land.

The 'back to the land' movement of a few years ago, which resulted in legislation encouraging the establishment of

small-holdings and empowering county councils to acquire and hold land for this purpose—particularly the post-war efforts to settle ex-service men on the land—has had some effect upon the commercial production of vegetables by adding to the number of cultivators. But the early anticipations of enthusiasts have not been fulfilled. Many hopes have been shattered. Much disappointment was experienced and many losses were incurred before it was realised that the cultivation of vegetables for a livelihood on a small area of land is a highly specialised job which requires more knowledge and experience than can be gained by a short course at a training centre, and a range of personal qualities not possessed by everyone. The competition with imported supplies is particularly difficult in the case of small-holders operating under the necessity of disposing of the whole of their produce under conditions which render difficult the adoption of co-operative or any other means of effectively combating the competition of selected foreign supplies.

The same pressure of forces that has driven the cultivation of vegetables into new localities has led to a change of method. The spade has given place to the plough. In the sixties of last century many acres of land along the Thames Valley were trenched by the spade every winter. Gangs of Irish labourers came over and were employed in the market gardens. Now the plough has supplanted the spade, and the tractor drawing a two-furrow plough and even the five-furrow steam plough are seen on vegetable farms. The strings of horse-drawn waggons bringing their loads of fresh vegetables to the markets are gone, and the steam waggon and the motor lorry transport produce from distances out of range twenty-five years ago. The complete reliance of a past generation upon supplies of stable manure to produce and maintain fertility has had to be modified. There would not be enough of it now to go round. The scarcity has forced the price up and cultivators have been driven to seek fertilisers in other forms. The scientist and the merchant have provided a full range of alternatives.

Although railways and motor transport have made commercial vegetable growing possible at greater distances from markets than before, it is still necessary for the industry to keep in close association with centres of population, for it requires a constant supply of skilled and unskilled labour, both male and female. The extent of the demand for labour depends upon the intensiveness of the cultivation followed. In mixed farming the employment is about three to five men per 100 acres. In vegetable farming it is about twenty to thirty men per 100 acres. In glasshouse farming from 200 to 300 men per 100 acres are employed. Not every class of soil is suitable for intensive vegetable cultivation, and in any localisation

of cultivators the soil of the area will be found to have been important factor in its selection. The thin chalks, as well the heavy clays, are unsuitable. The most favourable are t alluvial deposits along old river beds, the deeper light soils gravel, the better sandy loams, and the good loams on cha Soil has dictated the location of special culture in many instance for example, the Woking sands produce the long Surrey carro the deep alluvial soil of the river bed at Colchester and the abbey lands of Evesham have led to the production of asparag for which both districts are famous; the fertile plains of Lincol shire and Yorkshire provide the best potato lands in England, ar are equally good for broccoli, green peas, and other vegetable The sands of Bedfordshire, made fertile by the expenditure much patient labour and skill, were once famous for the producti of onions, but, in face of foreign competition, principally fr Egypt and Spain, the cultivators have turned to the Brusse sprout, and to parsley, parsnips, and other vegetables. In Ess the crop rotation followed on mixed farms on the light so enabled some wideawake farmers to squeeze a crop of peas on t half-summer fallows without displacing the turnips for sheep fee which is the rotation crop, and thousands of acres are th employed in spring. The early new potatoes and spring brocc of Cornwall, however, are due more to climatic advantages tha to soil. Special circumstances have led to specialisation in oth directions, which from small beginnings have expanded to ir portant industries. This is the case with the rhubarb forci of the Leeds district. The popular idea at one time was th the slender bundles of pink sticks crowned with yellow leafle which begin to grace the windows of greengrocers' shops abo Christmas time were grown in disused coal mines. No do the coal mines have a good deal to do with them, because it both the cheapness of the fuel which the proximity of the min makes possible and the complacence of the rhubarb plant flourish in the atmosphere which obtains where mines and mi operate that enable the skilful cultivators to turn out successi crops from the specially constructed forcing sheds into which t 'stools' of rhubarb are placed after being grown in the fields.

Situated as our country is, there is, as might be expecte much competition from more southern climes. The period most intensive competition is the spring of the year. C springs are often laggard, and plants that have been careful nursed in frames and greenhouses all winter, when planted o in the fields, are buffeted by cold winds or checked by fros nights, so that not only are the numbers depleted, but the earli maturing produce of milder climates, hurried by *grande vite* fast steamers, train ferry, or even aeroplanes, gets here first.

the cauliflowers of Italy, the broccoli and cabbages of Britta[illegible] the lettuces of France and Holland crowd our markets while home crops are still struggling to attain maturity. Spain, sends us soon after Christmas 'new' potatoes grown from se supplied from Britain, which our people prefer at 4*d*. or even a pound to home-grown potatoes at 1*d*. a pound, notwithstandi that experts say the food value of the latter is the greater. The supplies from foreign sources not only win the highest prices, also take some of the keenness off the edge of the appetite of consuming public. Despite these imports from warmer clim however, a good deal of forcing of vegetables in heated pits a under glass is still carried on. Seakale is an instance. T 'crowns' of this vegetable, after being grown in the fields duri summer, are lifted and laid in pits filled with soil under whi there are heated pipes. Kept in the dark, they produce t blanched head from the forcing out of the provision which t plant had laid up in the preceding summer. Seakale is a valuat addition to winter vegetables, and is gaining increased favou but it is not so well known outside the metropolis as it deserv to be. Under glass mint is forced, and early crops of beans, pe and vegetable marrows are produced. After spring the count is nearly self-dependent for vegetables except in the case tomatoes, which come from Holland in large quantities, as t figures below show :

	Cwts.	Value.
1924	381,547	602,471*l*.
1925	445,149	572,886*l*.
1926	431,562	750,364*l*.
1927	444,072	691,183*l*.
1928	491,854	701,374*l*.

These imported Dutch tomatoes are glasshouse grown ar come into direct competition with the produce of our own glas houses. It may be asked how is it that with the market at h door the home grower cannot ignore such competition ? To th there are several answers. First, social insurance and wag regulations, which are statutory here, have no counterpa abroad (however much this legislation deserves support social amelioration, it does, in fact, represent additional items the cost of production) ; secondly, our more northern latitu necessitates heavier expense for fuel ; thirdly, the differen in distance does not give so much advantage to the home grow as might be imagined, for the loading of consignments for shi ment which export necessitates enables the transport compani to give advantages, both as to rates and facilities, which the hon grower is not able to share. Finally, the industry shares wi

other home industries producing in competition with overseas supplies the handicap of the higher general level of taxation in this country.

The problem of transport, together with the allied one of distribution, constitutes one of the most urgent and difficult the growers have to face. The development that has taken place in road transport has been of great service, and is taken advantage of to the full. In the case of articles liable to such rapid deterioration after gathering as fresh vegetables, the facility afforded by collecting at the place of production and quick conveyance to the point of distribution without further handling or transference constitutes a valuable advantage. Notwithstanding this, a large proportion of vegetable produce is still rail-borne. The alternative offered by road transport has proved a valuable bargaining medium with the railway companies, but the enactment of the Road Transport Bills promoted by the railway companies is likely to destroy the Free Trade in transport upon which producers, who themselves have to face unrestricted world competition, relied in order to secure economic freight rates. More of the produce would be sent by the railways if those responsible for their management could see their way to accommodate their policy to growers' needs. An illustration of what those needs are is provided by one concession recently made by the railway companies, namely, the granting of reduced rates for bulked produce consigned to one consignee notwithstanding that the consignment so bulked consists of produce classified in several categories and on which formerly perhaps as many as half a dozen different rates would be payable. More privileges—if privileges they are—of this nature must be granted if the railways are to regain their popularity.

Distribution is chiefly along the line: grower–wholesale salesman–retailer–consumer. Some produce, though a diminishing amount, follows the shorter line: grower–retailer–consumer. There are those who think the ideal should be the direct line: grower–consumer. Some produce does, indeed, follow this line, but it can be only in small amounts, and is confined to postal deliveries and purely local transactions. In a few cases an additional step is introduced by speculation, and the line then is: grower – speculator – wholesale salesman – retailer – consumer. Sometimes the speculator operates between the wholesale salesman and the retailer. Here is the much-talked-of 'middleman' operating to the detriment of both producer and consumer. In the complexity of modern life, and with the world-wide range of the daily requirements of the average household, the wholesale market and the retail shop perform indispensable functions in the machinery of distribution. Salesmanship is becoming more

and more a science of itself in all departments of commerce, a the grower will be happy when he can devote his attention production, difficult enough of itself, with the confidence that i selling of his produce is in the hands of competent and relia experts. A great deal has been written and spoken about gap which exists between the price which is paid by the consum and the proceeds received by the producer. There is no do that a general lowering of the retail prices of vegetables, i could be brought about without diminishing the already too l returns to the grower, would be a great boon to the whole co munity. The Linlithgow Committee received evidence up this subject and reviewed it in their Report, but were unable discover that, generally speaking, the gap is unreasonable, were they able to suggest means for bridging or diminishi the gap:

> Fruit and vegetables are unique in the number and variety of int mediaries who may, at times, be engaged in handling the produce, whose sole service is that of distribution. Occasionally there may be many as six intermediaries between grower and consumer, as, for exam London commission salesman, London wholesaler, London commiss buyer, provincial wholesaler, second provincial wholesaler, provinc retailer. This may involve as many as sixteen to twenty different handli of the produce. Such cases are not general. They relate largely to p duce reconsigned from Covent Garden to the main provincial markets, m usually two intermediaries, namely, commission salesman and retailer, at most, three are involved, and these serve a useful purpose in the syst of distribution, their intervention being usually justifiable in the circu stances in which it occurs.

Thus the Committee reports. It is not to say that abuses not exist, nor that it is not possible to suggest improvements the working of the machinery of distribution to the advantage producer and consumer alike. The telephone has introduced new factor which is just beginning to tell. While it has becor a great convenience in enabling a grower to know the state of t market before consigning, its first effect, in some cases, is to more of a hindrance than a help. Some growers consistent consign all their produce to one salesman and seek to make friend of him; others have a list of selected markets and salesme whose telephoned reports are received each day and review before the consignments are apportioned. But many have settled plan, with the consequence that when the telepho discloses that prices are good at certain markets there is a rush consignments there to the point of saturation and prices slum while at the same time other markets, neglected, may be short supplies. The effect is bad prices to the grower and produ getting stale while it awaits buyers. The consumer cann benefit. The remedy is the organisation of distribution throu

an efficient intelligence service, so that instead of reconsignment from one market to another produce goes direct from the grower to the point of distribution to the retailer. But this needs first the standardisation of produce as to varieties, grades, packing and packages, a proposition which is very popular at present with the political mentors of the industry, but full of difficulties and pitfalls to those who attempt to apply it without full knowledge of and respect for the complicated conditions of the industry and its markets in this country.

A valuable first step in the direction of grading, packing, standardisation and research was taken by the glasshouse industry in the year 1922 in respect of tomatoes and cucumbers. Grades, grade designations, packing and package were agreed upon. These have now become standard. A further step was taken by a levy for the purpose of advertisement and propaganda. A trade mark was registered with the motto 'British and Best.' A research station at Cheshunt was established, which has been progressively enlarged, with the assistance and in co-operation with the Ministry of Agriculture, and has now, under the ægis of the Empire Marketing Board, been adapted to serve Empire as well as national needs for research into problems of glasshouse culture. The action of the Lea Valley growers has undoubtedly contributed to the popularity of the tomato, for it has furnished the retail trade with a continuous supply, during the season, of standardised produce which they could buy with confidence and display with satisfaction.

A further step was taken in 1927–28 by the establishment of a National Mark by legislation on lines first agreed between the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Farmers' Union, with the concurrence of the distributive trades, who all co-operate in the administration of the Act. The only vegetables to which at present the National Mark applies are tomatoes and cucumbers, and broccoli for export. There will, no doubt, be much more difficulty in bringing other vegetables within the National Mark scheme than in its application to apples, pears, and eggs, commodities already included. But these difficulties are not insurmountable, and its extension will be watched with great interest by the general public as well as by the agricultural industry.

The first effect of the National Mark scheme is to standardise the product into grade categories, which, as soon as they become known, afford the public a criterion of quality. Whenever a product is standardised it is lifted out of local limitations and given a national status. Quotations of prices have a recognised datum line and are comparable. Whenever invention shall provide a range of suitable non-returnable packages at economic prices, the produce will flow freely to wherever the demand

is greatest. Purchasers for retail sale will be relieved the admixture of produce of inferior grade or no grade amount of which cannot be known at time of purchase an loss on which must be passed on to the consumer. The g public will be gratified to find their vegetables presented to in convenient forms with the neatness and attractivene presentation they are accustomed to look for in other a of domestic economy. The National Mark itself is a silho of England and Wales with a medallion of the Union Jack centre, and the general public will do well to watch for and all encouragement to it.

In 1926 a move was made in the canning of veget Hitherto little had been done in this country, though incre quantities of canned fruit and vegetables were being impo The way this came about is interesting. The manufactur tinplate found the demand for their products falling disastrously. Formerly the tinplate to make the cans fo American canning industry came from this country. American Steel Corporation, however, captured the trade kept it there. Gradually a similar process took place in parts of the world as steel-making plants were established. foreign market for tinplate was drying up. With the materi making the cans at home, why, it was asked, could not products be canned at home? The co-operation of the Min of Agriculture was sought, and the National Food Canning Co was formed to encourage a home industry of canning by disse tion of information and propaganda. The advance in the ca of fruit has been phenomenal, though the only vegetable v at present is canned to any large extent is the green pea. research has been prosecuted into the scientific and pra problems involved at the Food Preservation Research Stati the University of Bristol, and knowledge obtained has been available for manufacturers. The canned home-grown peas put upon the market are unrivalled. As an instance o growth of the industry, a factory, opened in 1926, during canning season of 1929 dealt with the produce of 400 acr peas. Next year the same factory will can the produce of acres. Consideration is being given to the application o National Mark to canned produce, so that the purchaser can a guarantee of home-grown produce processed under condi agreed upon between the industry and the Ministry of Agricul

Two other matters need consideration to complete this su They are the diseases of the crops and the seed from which are produced.

It will have been gathered that the margin upon which vegetable grower works is exceedingly small and very precar

A spell of abnormal weather, misjudgment in marketing or mis-handling in selling, or a glut of produce, may destroy it altogether It is therefore extremely important that his chances should no be destroyed at the outset either by the depredations of diseas or pests or by failure or impurity of seed. Every year man losses are incurred from these two causes. Research into disease and pests is prosecuted at stations subsidised from Governmen sources. Notwithstanding the investigations that have furnishe complete records of the life-cycle of many diseases and pest methods of full control still remain to be found. The publi should realise that the expenditure of public money upon thi work is as much to the public benefit as to that of the growe The complete control of all diseases and pests, if it can be obtainec will, indeed, save the individual grower from many initial losse but with the general adoption of preventive measures, if and whe these are discovered, competition will assuredly transfer to th consumer in the form of lower prices the benefit of the remov of the burden on the industry now represented by the incidenc of disease and pests.

The industry is under a debt to our great seed firms for th enterprise and skill with which they have constantly improve old types and evolved new ones and for the purity of the seeds the offer. But there is no proprietary right in the names of seed Many names are given to the same variety. Thus a larg American seed firm has stated that seedsmen's catalogues carr the names of more than 2000 names of lettuce varieties, whil the number of distinct varieties known is about 200. Conversel different varieties are sold under the same name when it is foun to be popular. The facility with which varieties of the same genu will become intermixed through the action of pollen-carryin insects imposes the necessity for great care on the farms devote to seed producing. Where there is carelessness and want conscientiousness impure lines are the consequence and the grow is mulcted in loss.

Good work is being done upon this difficult subject at th University Farm at Cambridge. It is much to be regretted tha a scheme for the co-operation of the Ministry of Agriculture an the Royal Horticultural Society to establish a station and sub stations to work out pure lines of vegetable seeds and establis standard varieties, similar to the scheme established for th testing of new varieties of fruit, failed to mature.

Whether it is regarded from the point of view of the amour of capital invested or the number of persons employed, or th contribution made to the nation's food supply, the commerci production of vegetables is an important industry. In commo with all other sections of agriculture, it has, moreover, a uniqu

position as a producer of wealth. Every other producing industry transforms some natural product into an article of commerce, but in transforming it does nothing to replace it. The cultivator, on the other hand, uses the forces and products of Nature, and in the process replaces them in a form available for future use. His operations leave no empty caverns of used-up mines, no jagged escarpment of quarried hills. His co-operation turns to wealth Nature's forces of sun and rain and air, forces that run to waste on untilled land. Generations of tillage maintain and ever increase the fertility of the soil—there is no fear of exhaustion. Yet it is a fact—a fact which came home with startling suddenness to the nation in 1917, and held its attention for exactly eighteen months—that the production of the homeland is scarcely half the potential output, and yet that fractional production means in existing economic circumstances over-production. Meanwhile, the industry stands pilloried before the nation for the lowness of its wages, and capital fights shy of it, for its profits have always been precarious. Those who are charged with the responsibility of representative leaders are anxiously seeking for remedies for the existing state of things. They cannot complain of lack of advisers. Whether there are remedies, and, if so, whether they lie in the realm of politics or economics, one thing seems clear, and that is that it would pay the urban part of the population to give their attention to the condition of their basic industry.

W. G. Lobjoit.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FAMILY

THE family has now become a problem. This is one of the outstanding facts of present-day civilisation. In the Victorian age, whatever else might be challenged, marriage and the family were taken for granted. Nietzsche said of Strauss that he broke away from orthodoxy while unquestioningly accepting the orthodox system of morals. That was typical.

Now the questioning has gone deeper, and we have drawn the whole sphere of sex ethics into its field. A glance at contemporary literature reveals the tremendous change that has taken place. In every other novel written by a man (and in three-quarters, at least, of those written by women) the institution of marriage is challenged. In the course of a somewhat extensive perusal of present-day periodicals I find it quite a rare event to come across any article dealing with marriage or sex questions that is not more or less definitely anti-monogamous. Such works as Judge Lindsey's *The Revolt of Modern Youth*, Mr. Calverton s *The Bankruptcy of Marriage*, Mr. Walter Lippmann's *A Preface to Morals*, Mr. Bertrand Russell's *Marriage and Morals*, Count Keyserling's *Marriage*, Professor Wieth-Knudsen's *Feminism*, as well as almost the entire literature of modern feminism, must convince all those who have studied the matter that there exists to-day what may fairly be described as a world-wide revolt against marriage and the family.

A whole series of influences now conspire to work against the family. Our modern economic system, as Olive Schreiner so clearly pointed out, has undermined the family by taking away from the home and transferring to the factory most of the activities which once made home life the centre of human interest. The education of children, too, is now increasingly being removed from the family to the school, kindergarten, and crèche. At the same time, the rapid decline in the birth rate tends to diminish the significance of the home to an immense number of women. One of the problems of life in England and America is the woman, no longer young, who has already brought up one or two children and is now left with nothing to do.

Further, the increased pressure of competition in the life of

to-day makes it difficult for men to marry; while the entry of a large army of women into the labour market creates a vicious circle—the more women who go out to work the fewer men can marry, the fewer men who marry the more women must go out to work, and so on. It would scarcely be too much to say that the entire structure of our social and economic life is such as to work against the family and to encourage the formation of temporary sex relationships.

Again, there can be no question but that the religious beliefs which lie behind the monogamous family have lost ground heavily during the last two or three generations; and the experience of history shows us that only a short interval (a 'time-lag') elapses between the decay of beliefs and the disintegration of the moral systems based upon those beliefs. We are now witnessing a gradual relapse (generally proclaiming itself as 'progress') back to pagan standards of morality. The standards of the Christian faith are high and difficult, and when the faith grows weak, people will no longer attempt to reach them.

These important matters are here merely mentioned in passing, since the purpose of this article is to deal more specifically with what Mr. Montgomery Belgion calls 'our present philosophy of life'[1] in its relation to the family. It would be an exceedingly difficult task to give an academically accurate definition of this new life philosophy; but it seems to me to consist, in essence, in a greatly intensified individualism. All definite ethical standards are repudiated, in the interests of a purely subjective life-outlook. The *individual* is made the measure of all things, and positive truth suffers a sort of deliquescence, so that everything becomes a matter of private opinion. Its catchwords are 'self-expression,' 'self-development,' 'the right to freedom.' It is necessarily anti-family and anti-monogamous. It has no clearly defined positive basis, because freedom alone is essentially negative. We have to-day a chaotic mass of loosely held private opinions resulting from the disintegration of positive Christianity, united solely in their common emphasis on the rights of the individual as against all authority and positive morality. We should not be very far wrong in saying that the 'present philosophy' marks the victory of the *ego-centric* life-outlook over the *sozio-centric*.

The family is inevitably a key position in the conflict between the new and the old philosophies; and, as Mr. Wyndham Lewis says in that very penetrating, if somewhat obscure, analysis of modern life, *The Art of Being Ruled*, the disintegration of the family under the incessant attacks of modernism is *the* central problem of our age.

A classical document of the new individualism, in its bearing

[1] *Cf. Our Present Philosophy of Life* (Faber and Faber).

upon the family, is *Marriage in the New World* (contained in Keyserling's symposium *Marriage*), by Dr. Beatrice Hinkle, one of New York's leading women doctors, from which I take the following typical passage: 'Woman's struggle to-day is the mighty birth-throes of a new self. The cult of the ego which dominates this age has produced its effect upon her, and she is becoming articulate and thinking—she is demanding recognition for herself as an individual, separate and distinct from man.' Man and woman have become 'two distinct personalities . . . the twain are no longer one flesh.' Here we have, in a nutshell, the marriage problem of to-day. The meaning of marriage, to those who have not broken with the Christian tradition, is the union of two personalities. Behind it lies the belief that neither of these two would have attained to their fullest development had they remained in separate distinctness. This quotation (as is indeed clear enough from the rest of the article) means much more than the freeing of woman from subjection. It implies a view of marriage that is the flat negation of the Christian view. It rests upon the entirely false assumption that each individual is a complete whole, and will best develop in the fullest possible independence. Like the whole literature of feminism, it denies the bi-polarity of humanity. Woman is not an individual separate and distinct from man. She is one half of the race, inseparably linked, for good or evil, with the other half, and fundamentally incapable (much more even than man) of achieving salvation through self-centred detachment.

Dr. Hinkle herself admits, with admirable candour, that the practical results of the new individualism are destructive, that marriage has been made immeasurably more difficult. But it is her belief that there can be no going back; the only way is forward through an ever-increasing individualism until at last the stage is reached when fully emancipated separate personalities have evolved a free ethic. The old ideals of duty to society and the family are 'gone, never to return.'

Assuredly no one to-day is going to deny woman's right to become 'articulate and thinking.' But what we have here is a totally false statement of the problem. On the one hand, lies (it is implied) subjection and no thinking; on the other, thinking and emancipation through separatism and the disruption of the family. The assumption that when women think they will at once perceive their complete separateness from men is as ludicrous as it is typically modern. Nowhere are women more keenly intelligent and more capable of thought than in France; and nowhere do women realise more fully how inseparably their welfare is united to that of man and the family.

I have dwelt upon Dr. Hinkle's contribution because it is

thoroughly typical. Recent works dealing with the famil a 'progressive' standpoint are mere restatements of th *Lebensanschauung*. Thus in *Halcyon* (a recent book by on leaders of English feminism) we find the same questions an in the same way. The goal is always self-development, argument is always based on the assumption that this ment will be fatally hampered by positive social ties. never any perception whatever of the ancient truth that it exactly the acceptance of definite moral and social duties may lift the individual above his petty selfhood into a lar The whole can be aptly described in the words Burke ap the 'new conquering empire of light and reason' of the Revolution, as a 'mechanic philosophy,' 'the offspring hearts and muddy understandings . . . void of solid w

At this stage some reader will exclaim: 'Why sho bother about a handful of intellectuals? Let them sa they like, we shall just carry on.' It is very important t to this objection, because it reveals a complete failure t the modern situation.

It is, of course, perfectly true that millions of peop no notice of 'progressive' ideas. They continue to live marry and bring up children. *But these millions are inar* They are almost entirely without influence upon the co events. On the other hand, the circles that are self-co and artistically and intellectually creative are saturated and through with the 'cult of the ego,' and from th influence percolates downwards until it reaches, in one another, every stratum of the national life. To-day, largely to the ubiquitous cinema, there is scarcely a boy o the remotest village who has not caught some hint of t gospel of self-development and erotic liberty. If the C are powerless to work against this influence, it is not least they are themselves deeply permeated, in varying degree modern individualism.

The new life-outlook is not a matter which can be r as confined to cliques of 'high-brows'; it permeates th life of the community, and is coming increasingly to d our social legislation. Things have already gone so far very well-informed critic, Mr. V. F. Calverton, writes: attitude now dominant in Soviet Russia, which rega relationship as a matter entirely private and personal, with State nor convention as supervisor, is the attitude that is becoming accepted, in practice if not in theory, by the re world' (*The Bankruptcy of Marriage*, p. 308).

If the State were really neutral the situation would b less favourable to the new morality than it really is.

are now compelled to face the fact that the State is closely allied with the forces which attack the family.

The decay of the family brings with it certain evils (for example, the underfeeding of young children or the neglect of maternity). At once there is a call for State action. The State accordingly takes over these functions from the family, and the latter is automatically rendered superfluous. The best way to destroy a social institution is to supplant it. Year by year the State advances further and further into the field of the ever-weakening family. We see this going on, but we cannot stop it. In a short time, as time goes in national affairs, the family will have no *raison d'être*, save as a sentimental association.

Even a thinker like Mr. Bertrand Russell, who certainly cannot be accused of reactionary sympathies, views the impending extinction of the family with alarm. On page 162 of his new work *Marriage and Morals* he writes: 'Although the law means to uphold the family, it has in modern times increasingly intervened between parents and children, and is gradually becoming, against the wish and intention of law-makers, one of the chief engines for the break-up of the family system.' We may not agree with Mr. Russell's positive suggestions (which I will not here examine, as they are well known), but few will quarrel with him when he anticipates from the decay of the family a very serious impoverishment of emotional life, and a gradual cessation of parenthood. After all, as he pertinently remarks, why should people bother to rear children at all for the benefit of the State? It is the highroad to racial decay that we now tread in the name of progress.

In a short while, say in ten years, we shall in all probability see the introduction of family allowances (or some other endowment of motherhood). This will, of course, be another nail in the coffin of the family, because it marks a yet more advanced stage in the assumption by the State of parental function; that it would greatly reduce the interest of the father (especially) in his offspring is clear, for it tends to make him superfluous.

Such a measure will scarcely be upon the Statute-book (prophesies Mr. Russell) before an agitation (led by feminists) will begin on behalf of illegitimate children. In a couple of years, at most, they will receive allowances putting them on a level with legitimate children; for who to-day can resist an appeal on behalf of innocent children? It will then make little or no difference, economically, to a woman of the poorer classes whether she has a husband or not. The children will be the joint property of the mother and the State, after the style of the primitive matriarchies. Once this were accomplished, 'the family would probably cease, after a time, to be bi-parental, the father being

of no more importance than among cats and dogs' (Bertrand Russell, *ibid.*, p. 168).

Another step in the same direction (although one less imminent than family allowances) is the so-called *companionate marriage*—now the subject of a vigorous propaganda in advanced feminist circles. Couples are to be permitted, legally and socially, to live together as man and wife, without any legal responsibilities being incurred by the man, for a certain trial period (say two years); if at the end of that time no children are born, the union may be dissolved by consent; but if there should be children, there must be a marriage. In practice, it would soon come to mean that people would not marry at all unless they wished to have children. Why should a man undertake the responsibilities of a husband when, under this plan, he could enjoy a socially recognised union without them? It is sufficiently obvious that such a custom would speedily take us back to the moral level of the primitive semi-promiscuous matriarchy where girls live first with one man and then with another until they are pregnant, when their unions become somewhat more stable, the man's *rôle* being, throughout, that of a mere fertiliser of the female.

A ' trial trip ' of this sort is not a trial *marriage* at all; it is a *purely erotic relationship*, stripped of the peculiar moral and racial factors and various atmospheric influences which make marriage a different thing from an irresponsible sex relationship. It is essentially individualistic, private and personal, and hence deprived of the vital, social, energising influences which help to make a marriage. The mere fact that the relationship was intended from the beginning to be experimental would give it an unstable psychological character, while the deliberate rejection of maternity on the part of the girl would introduce an element of cool calculation, preventing the full fruition of the emotional and instinctive possibilities of the union. There is a good deal of evidence (some of which has been collected by Mr. Ludovici in *The Night-Hoers*) to show that calculated sterility (especially at the beginning of a marriage) creates its own psychology, the diversion of sex instinct from its racial purpose causing morbidities (such as inversion and an extreme dread of maternity on the part of the wife, and inhibited development). After all, how many of the free sex relationships which are now common enough end in happy marriages? Very few. Why, then, expect so much more from the companionate marriage?

It is perhaps hardly worth while to attempt a refutation of proposals like these; but the mere fact that they are being seriously discussed on every hand is a rather startling indication of the ground we have covered since Victorian times.

One thing stands out clear: the various factors making for

a disintegration of the family are all closely interlocked; they re all phases or by-products of the same thing—namely, the idividualistic and naturalistic life-outlook, the 'Rousseauism' f Mr. Irving Babbitt (author of *Democracy and Leadership*). lan is no longer regarded (from this standpoint) as a spiritual eing rooted in a world of religious and ethical truth; he becomes superior sort of animal—nothing more. His whole object in life to gratify his desires and instincts. He must make money and ijoy himself; at the best, develop his mind. All positive moral alues, all positive truth, and all clear moral standards vanish. /hat the individual does with his life is his own concern. If he inclined to live polygamously—well, let him; if he is homo-xual, there is really no valid reason why he should not satisfy is inclinations, and so on. This purely materialistic and ego-entric philosophy not only lies behind the economic welter of -day; it is also the mental background of modern feminism specially in the Anglo-Saxon lands) and of the whole of the iovement for a 'new' morality.

The opposed view, that of traditional Christianity, still holds a onsiderable territory, and its strength is greatly underrated by opponents. But the naturalistic ethic is coming more and ore to dominate our practical life and social movements. The iject of all present-day social reform is to make people com-rtable in a material sense; it is entirely indifferent to moral :andards.

It was upon the cultural level of primitive naturalism that the atriarchy arose, and as we are now returning (*viâ* science) to iother, more sophisticated, naturalism, which rejects spirit, ot from ignorance, but from supposed knowledge, it is not, after l, very extraordinary that the moral life of the age shows a arked tendency to follow the lines it took in pre-Christian and e-patriarchal days. M. Briffault (author of *The Mothers*), the eat authority on the ancient matriarchies, states plainly in his reword to Mr. Calverton's work on marriage (see above) that e whole drift of modern civilisation is in the direction of a turn to the moral standards and customs of the matriarchy. r. Bertrand Russell, although not using the same terminology, is already, as we have seen, envisaged this development, resulting om the concentration in the hands of the mother and the State the powers in which the father formerly had a large share.) rapid has been the transference to the State of functions rmerly exercised by the father that the man of to-day has not t woken up to his changed position; he is, however, vaguely nscious of something wrong, but his own humanitarianism rtually compels him to acquiesce in each step in this direction, r these steps are represented as being necessary in the interests

of the child or the woman, or both (*cf.* family allowances), ai Anglo-Saxon civilisation the man comes after the woman child. There is thus a kind of fatal necessity about the v process.

It might at first sight seem that a serious contradiction between the 'cult of the ego,' the moral individualism to w I have referred, and the ever-increasing power of the mo Socialist State. In reality here, too, there is the closest pos connexion. The solvent power of individualism, which integrates all social nuclei (such as the family), thus destrc the organic unity of society, is just the very thing which con the State to intervene in order to preserve, if only by mecha means, some semblance of unity.

It is a seeming paradox, but what calls itself Socialism tc is usually an outcrop of extreme individualism ; it is a revo autonomous intellectualists against tradition and authority, does not create a new social ethic transcending indivi atomism. It does, however, tend to place in the hands of the S powers formerly possessed by the socially orientated indivic who now, in his ego-centricity, cannot be trusted to govern l self, but must be drilled and managed by the modern techı State. As Cardinal Gaspari recently stated, we have now rea a pass when there is no real choice, save between licence force. On the one hand, lies a total disintegration througł checked individualism ; on the other, the forcible interventic the State to save us from ourselves.

In the centre of the crisis stands the family. In proportio this nucleus of personal and social life is broken up we fall the hands of the impersonal, mechanical State.

MEYRICK BOOT

A TENTH-CENTURY FEMINIST

It is a common and a pleasing belief that we live in an age of enlightenment—a belief that is not without foundation, even though we have a long way yet to go before the whole human race shall be guided by the rules of pure reason and obey the laws of strict morality. But this belief is often accompanied, and partly vitiated, by a delusion. We consider, with just pride, the progress which the twentieth century in some directions has made, and we draw the false inference that because the tenth century, for example, knew nothing of wireless, of motor cars, of aviation and of poison gas, it was, therefore, a period of unmitigated gloom, a time when men lived as barbarians, when learning was regarded with contempt, and when the arts and sciences had almost ceased to exist. As regards literature, at least, this is a cardinal mistake. The practice of literary composition has been immeasurably diffused, and we have now a mob of ladies and gentlemen amongst us who write with ease. But diffusion has dissipated energy, and the conditions of modern life are unfavourable to that intense concentration which alone can produce work of permanent value. Here the tenth century has an advantage over the twentieth, and it may well be doubted if there is a single author, male or female, anywhere to-day who can equal some of the writers who were born soon after the year 900, in what is popularly known as the darkest period of the Dark Ages.

This phrase ' the Dark Ages ' sums up an error which has been sedulously fostered by classical scholars. Our teachers have always rightly considered that the masterpieces of Greek and Roman literature are of vital importance, and that they alone supply us with a standard of comparison whereby literary excellence can be judged. But it is possible for the best to be the enemy of the good ; and this is what has happened in our Greek and Latin studies. Greek literature for us has begun with Homer and ended with Aristotle ; Latin has begun with Plautus and ended with Suetonius. Hellenistic Greek and mediæval Latin have until lately been regarded as definitely outside the pale, dangerous and deleterious stuff likely to corrupt the palate trained to appreciate the fine vintages of the Attic and the Augustan Ages.

The result has been that the great mass of Latin written in the twelve centuries between 200 and 1400 for many years been most undeservedly neglected in this and that we are only now beginning to realise that Europe, during those centuries, there were centres w arts flourished in spite of war and tumults; that ther public capable of appreciating and criticising the variou of prose and verse, and that authors then trained the for their task by a prolonged study of the masters of t There were periods when production slackened and grea were few; there were periods of mental activity that p not one but many brilliant writers; there never was a tin the torch of learning was completely extinguished.

We speak of *the* Renaissance of the fifteenth centur perhaps that marvellous efflorescence of all the arts dese exclusive title. But if we confine ourselves to literatur there were at least three occasions after the decay of Roman civilisation when a similar galaxy of great writer taneously appeared. The generation living at the begi the fourth century, who saw in 313 the establishment l stantine of Christianity as the religion of the State, soo wards witnessed the birth of three distinguished poets, A Claudian and Prudentius, of Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, famous as theologian and as writer of hymns, and of tl men whose works were for many centuries the most wid of all books—Jerome, the translator of the Bible int Augustine, of the *Confessions* and the *City of God*, and M Capella, author of that encyclopædia of learning *The* *of Mercury and Philology*. These seven all came into th within a space of forty years, and, outside the age of Peri the age of Augustus, it would be difficult to find any p literature of equal length that could match this in produc of genius.

The next occasion, some 500 years later, is identified name of the only European ruler in all those centur deserves a place by Constantine's side. Charles the Gr not only a brave warrior and a wise king; he was also a lover of learning, and in the course of his reign he gathere him a brilliant circle of poets and historians. To give a c list would be a tedious business, but even a few names w the amount of talent then in Europe ready to respond to j encouragement. Theodulf, for example, the Pindar of t circle, a Goth by race and born in North Spain, appeare about 781, and, as a reward for his elegant verses, w presented with the bishopric of Orleans. Alcuin, o Flaccus, was brought by the Emperor from York to r

and superintend the royal school. Einhard, the builder of churches, 'Bezaleel,' who wrote the life of his great master, came from the banks of the Main, and from across the Alps the grammarian and poet Peter of Pisa and his friend Paul Warnefrid, the historian of the Lombards. These men, and many others with them, all flourished at Charles' court, and the death of the great king in 814 did not altogether end the Carolingian Renaissance, for there is an afterglow of poetry, marked by the names of Raban Maur, Walafrid Strabo, Gottschalk and Sedulius Scotus, which lasted well into the middle of the ninth century.

The next revival came after no very long interval. The beginning of the tenth century was a period exceptionally unfavourable to peaceful pursuits. Saracens from the south, Danes from the north, Hungarians from the east were all busy harrying and plundering the politer communities of Central and Southern Europe. But once again civilisation triumphed over barbarism, and under Otto the Great of Saxony we have what is called by German scholars 'Die Ottonische Renaissance,' in which Hroswitha and Liudprand are the two brightest stars, Gerbert, Widukind, Rather and Flodoard the lesser luminaries.

Otto, like Charles, was crowned as head of the Holy Roman Empire, and, like Charles, he was as anxious to encourage the arts of peace as he was to extend his power by force of arms. Of literature he was an enlightened and generous patron, and, although the great writers of his period are not quite so numerous as those of Charles' time, Hroswitha and Liudprand are of such remarkable quality that they would make any age illustrious. Liudprand, the Bishop of Cremona, is that rare thing, a historian who is also a humorist. Hroswitha, the nun of Gandersheim, is a playwright who is also a moralist, having for her chief object the spiritual edification of her audience. Liudprand is perhaps the more entertaining of the pair; he was a traveller and a scholar, a courtier, diplomat and bishop, and the varied interests of his life are reflected in the vivid pages of his *Antapodosis* and *Embassy to Constantinople*. But Hroswitha is the finer and the rarer genius, for she draws all her material from her inner consciousness and lived the whole of her peaceful life within the precincts of the Abbey of Gandersheim.

Gandersheim is now a quiet little town nestling in a wide Brunswick valley, and is chiefly known for the excellent beer which it brews. But in the tenth century it was a place of importance, the seat of an authority, both spiritual and temporal, which, though always in a woman's hands, gave that woman power of life and death over all the males of the district. The Abbess of Gandersheim held direct from the king; she had her own law courts, her own mint and coinage, and her own men-at-

arms. As a feudal baron she had a right to a seat at the Imperia Diet—a right which was exercised as late as 1803 by Dorothea Augusta of Brunswick—and on many occasions she was a membe of the royal house of Saxony. But she was also the head of great religious and educational establishment where the rule of St Benedict was strictly observed and all worldly luxuries prohibited Her nuns, as a mediæval chronicler tells us, 'were forbidden t eat away from the common table at the appointed times, excep in case of sickness. They slept together and came together t celebrate the canonical hours. And they set to work togethe whenever work had to be done.' To preside successfully ove such a community required qualities of a very high order, an we know from Hroswitha herself that the abbess in her time— Gerberg, niece of the Emperor Otto—was not only a good woma and a great administrator, but also a sound classical scholar 'Younger in years than I, but far older in learning.'

The phrase comes from the preface which Hroswitha wrot for what seems to have been her first literary production, th set of poems on the Christian martyrs. These pieces, whic include an account of Christ's nativity and ascension, are mostl in leonine hexameters with internal rhyme, and to all lovers o martyrology they are of great interest. The material is usuall drawn from ancient records, but Hroswitha adds many touche of her own. Her story of the martyrdom of St. Agnes, fo example, whose presence purified the house of ill-fame to whic she was consigned and whose chastity shamed its frequenter into repentance, is a most vivid piece of writing. Even mor striking is the tale of Pelagius, which Hroswitha heard from a eye-witness. Pelagius lived at Cordoba in Hroswitha's time, an was so comely of person that the Caliph Abderrahman, who the ruled in Spain, wished to make him his minion. The Christia youth, of course, indignantly refused, and was thereupon hande over to the executioner. He was first shot from a catapult, bu escaped unhurt; then he was beheaded and his body thrown int the river. The manner in which fishermen found his head an the miracle that followed form the conclusion of the poem.

The third section of Hroswitha's works, also in verse, is les exciting than this, but possesses considerable historical value It consists of two long hexameter poems, the first containin a history of the Abbey of Gandersheim from its foundation i 850 by Liudulf and his wife Oda down to the writer's own times; the second, now incomplete, relating in epic style the chie exploits of the Emperor Otto I. But Hroswitha's poems, whether mystical or historical, are not her true title to fame. They are chiefly important as showing that a woman in the tent century, without any distinct poetical gift, had sufficient trainin

in literature to write better verse than most of our contemporary bards can achieve. Her real genius is revealed in the six prose plays that come second in the manuscript found by Conrad Celtes at Ratisbon in the fifteenth century,[1] the *Gallicanus*, *Dulcitius*, *Sapientia*, *Calimachus*, *Pafnutius* and *Abraham*.

Of these, the first, and least significant, three deal with the conflict between Christianity and Paganism, and their plots are briefly as follows: In *Gallicanus* the hero, one of Constantine's generals, claims the Emperor's daughter in marriage as the reward of his military services. Constantine dare not refuse him openly, but knows that his daughter has taken the vow of virginity; and finally, at her suggestion, he delays his answer and sends her two chaplains to attend the general on his next campaign. Their ministrations are successful. Gallicanus becomes a Christian, and on his return regretfully abandons his plans of marriage and allows his intended bride to remain a virgin.

The second play in this group, *Dulcitius*, differs from the rest in being distinctly humorous in parts. Dulcitius, a governor under Diocletian, has three Christian virgins handed over to him for examination. Enraptured by their beauty, he orders them to be confined in his scullery among the kitchen utensils; and when night falls he, with the worst of intentions, pays them a secret visit. Fortunately, in the darkness he mistakes the round pots upon the walls for the virgins' swelling bosoms, and, embracing them tenderly, covers himself with soot and grime. So changed, indeed, is his appearance after this amorous encounter that his own soldiers fail to recognise him, and he is driven off as a vagabond. Thus far the play is broadly comical, but the later scenes are serious. The virgins still refuse to renounce their faith, and two of them are burned alive, while their younger sister, rescued from shame by angelic intervention, is shot on the mountain to which she escapes, and dies praising Christ.

If Hroswitha shows some levity in *Dulcitius*, she makes full amends when she brings the lamentable story of *Sapientia* upon the stage. The scene is set in Hadrian's palace at Rome, and the action begins with a complaint laid before the Emperor by a Roman patrician. A certain foreign woman, it appears, named Sapientia, 'Wisdom,' has come to Rome with her three daughters —Faith, Hope and Charity—and is persuading the Roman matrons to refuse all their marital duties. Hadrian summons the foreigners into his presence, but on questioning the mother about her daughters' ages, he himself has to submit to a long and highly ingenious lecture on the qualities of numbers. Brushing this information aside, the tyrant orders the three young girls

[1] The best modern edition of Hroswitha's complete works is that of Winterfeld—*Hrotsvithae Opera*. (P. de Winterfeld, Berlin, 1902.)

to offer sacrifice to his gods, and on their refusal has them put to death by the most cruel tortures. Their dead bodies are given to their mother, and in the last act Sapientia lays her children in the grave, and then, in a magnificent speech, prays that she also may die and falls lifeless by their side.

The three remaining plays deal with another conflict, the eternal struggle between the spirit and the flesh, and show, to the best of Hroswitha's ability, the evils that unlawful love brings in its train. Their aim is entirely moral, but the author thinks it prudent to write an apologetic preface :

> You will find some Catholics, and I cannot entirely hold myself guiltless, who, attracted by the charm of a polished style, prefer the empty foolishness of pagan literature to the useful lessons of the holy scriptures. There are others who, although they cling to the sacred pages and despise most pagan authors, yet too frequently peruse the plays that Terence invented, and while they find pleasure in his delightful dialogue, pollute themselves with the knowledge of things unspeakable. Therefore, I, the Strong Voice of Gandersheim, have not hesitated to imitate, on the stage, an author whom others cherish in their studies. He deals with the shameless profligacy of wanton women : I, to the best of my poor ability, use his method to glorify the laudable chastity of Christian virgins. One thing, however, has often embarrassed me and brought a hot blush to my cheek—the form of my work has compelled me to set forth the detestable madness of unlawful love and the poisoned sweetness of such lover's talk. These things, which we are forbidden even to mention, I have had to imagine for my plays and give as themes to my dutiful pen. Still, if from modesty I had passed all this by, I should not have fulfilled my purpose nor should I have set forth to the best of my power the praise of innocence. The more seductive a lover's blandishments, the more sublime we prove the glory of our heavenly helper and the more wonderful the triumph of our victory. And this is especially true when it is female weakness that wins the day and manly strength that is put to confusion.

Of these feminist dramas *Calimachus* is the most tragic and has the strongest plot, although it is not written in Hroswitha's most characteristic manner. Fired by love for the saintly Drusiana, Calimachus confesses his passion to her, and Drusiana, who has even refused her husband's lawful embraces, in her horror prays to Christ that she may die. Her prayer is granted ; she is laid in her tomb, and one of her servants set to guard her. Calimachus, still maddened with desire, comes to the grave, and, bribing the servant, is about to take the dead body in his arms when a monstrous serpent appears and kills both men. Their corpses are found by the husband and the Apostle John, who, in a final scene, revives Drusiana and recalls Calimachus to life and repentance. Even the wicked servant has the same mercy shown to him, but on returning to life he refuses to repent and is handed back again to his master, Satan. *Calimachus*, in spite of some crudities, is a very remarkable work which has success-

[illegible]ly stood the test of a London performance, and any critic who [illegible]as present at the Haymarket Theatre one afternoon some years [illegible]o, when it was acted side by side with two plays by modern [illegible]ramatists, had then a practical example given him of the differ-[illegible]nce between genius and talent.

Pafnutius also comes into comparison with modern work, for [illegible]e same story has been treated by Anatole France in his *Thaïs*, [illegible]om which Massenet drew the libretto of his opera. France was [illegible]cquainted with Hroswitha, and in an essay in *La Vie Littéraire*[illegible] [illegible]e extends to her his usual bland patronage; but perhaps he [illegible]carcely realised that her simple play will survive when his [illegible]aboured novel has been long forgotten. *Pafnutius* begins with [illegible] delightful dialogue in which the hermit tells his disciples of [illegible]'s resolve to disguise himself as a pleasure seeker and to convert [illegible]he notorious Thais. Then come the wonderful scenes in which [illegible]he courtesan accepts Christ and humbly follows her new guide [illegible]o the convent where she is to pass the rest of her days doing [illegible]enance for her sins. Three years elapse, and in the last act [illegible]'afnutius, assured of the sinner's pardon, returns to the convent, [illegible]nds Thais dying, and stays by her side until her soul has winged [illegible]s way to heaven.

The plot of *Abraham* is in some respects similar to that of [illegible]*afnutius*, but there are subtle points of difference. When the [illegible]lay opens, Mary, the niece of the hermit Abraham, is a child of [illegible]ight living in the desert under the care of her uncle and his [illegible]ld friend Effrem. Ten years pass, and a stranger beguiles her [illegible]way. Then, after long searching, Abraham is informed that Mary [illegible]s living a life of shame in a neighbouring city. He therefore [illegible]isguises himself, borrows a horse and some money, and goes to [illegible]ve the lost sheep. How he finds her in the pimp's house may [illegible]e read in Miss St. John's excellent translation of the six plays,[2] [illegible]ut perhaps the conclusion of that recognition scene may be [illegible]ven here:

ABRAHAM. Now the time has come to take off my disguise and show [illegible]er who I am. Mary, my adopted daughter, you who were half of my soul! [illegible]o you recognize the old man who reared you like a father, and betrothed [illegible]ou to the Son of the King of Heaven?

MARY. What shall I do! It is my father Abraham, my teacher, who [illegible]peaks.

ABRAHAM. What has come to you, daughter?

MARY. Bitter trouble.

ABRAHAM. Who deceived you? Who led you astray?

MARY. He who ruined our first parents.

ABRAHAM. Where is that angel's life you once led on earth?

MARY. Gone, gone to perdition.

[2] *The Plays of Roswitha*, translated by C. St. John. (Chatto and Windus, [illegible]ondon, 1923.)

ABRAHAM. Where is your maidenly modesty? Where your lovely chastity?

MARY. Lost, lost.

ABRAHAM. If you do not come to your right mind again, what reward can you expect for all the toil of your fastings, prayers, and vigils? You have fallen from the heights of heaven and plunged yourself in the depths of hell.

MARY. How wretched am I!

ABRAHAM. Why did you not trust me? Why did you leave me? Why did you not tell me of your fall? My beloved Effrem and I would have done a worthy penance for you.

MARY. When I was fallen and sunk in sin I did not presume to approach your holy presence in my filthiness.

ABRAHAM. Who ever lived that was free from sin, save only the Virgin's Son?

MARY. No one.

ABRAHAM. To sin is human, to persist in sinning is devilish. We cannot justly condemn those who fall unawares: we should rather blame those who refuse to rise as soon as may be.

It is difficult to represent in English the stark simplicity of Hroswitha's Latin, but even a translation will make plain the manner in which she deals with a situation which has led many a modern author into false pathos and mawkish sentiment. *Humanum est peccare, diabolicum in peccatis durare:* such is the moral of the play, and Mary is no hardened sinner; she leaves the city, goes back with her uncle to the desert, and in repentance finds happiness.

Much nonsense has been written in the past, and will doubtless be written in the future, about the inferiority of the female to the male mind as revealed in literature. It has even been asserted that women are, by nature, incapable of producing a really great work of art. The fallacy lies in identifying greatness with size and in supposing that the grandiose must, of necessity, take the highest place. A lion is larger than a bee, but a hive is a much greater work of art than is a lion's den. The truth seems to be that women artists have always preferred to work in a restricted sphere and have relied on simplicity as their chief instrument. Sappho is a great poet; the *Hymn to Aphrodite* is not as long as the *Iliad*, but it is its equal in sublimity. Jane Austen is a great novelist: she does not attempt the 'big bow-wow' style of Sir Walter Scott, but the author of *Waverley* knew where the truth lay. Hroswitha is in the same case: she is a great playwright, and certainly the most sympathetic of all the Latin dramatists. She has not the boisterous humour of Plautus nor the urbane wit of Terence, but she has other qualities which they do not possess. Her prose dialogue is more lifelike than their verse can ever be; she has a deeper insight into character than

ley usually show; above all, her Christian charity puts to shame ne one's careless levity and the other's cynical indifference. Iroswitha not only creates her characters, she loves them. She es not wish merely to please her readers, she desires to make iem better men and women.

F. A. Wright.

TIME, IMAGINATION AND THE MODERN NOVELIST

A WRITER in the September number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* has remarked that the most interesting developments in modern fiction are concerned with the question of Time. This is true, and it opens up avenues of speculation. These may end in tangles which are for us insoluble—the present writer, at any rate, makes no pretence of solving them—but they are of absorbing interest alike for the artist and the plain man. We are immersed in the flux of Time, and we long, not only for happiness, but for permanence. The imaginative writer creating a world of his own gives, or tries to give, to this impression and to this desire a sharper and intenser form than can be found in commonplace experience. This has always been so, but in our modern age, at once more self-conscious, more analytic and less confident than the old, the effort has taken on a more complicated and, in some ways, a more poignant character.

Roughly speaking, there are three questions about Time which for the purposes of this paper may be taken as the most important. And they are all connected. The first is bound up with the profound difference felt to subsist between happiness to come and happiness that is gone; the next with the impression of momentary events continually slipping away, and with the suspicion whether, none the less, all these elusive moments may somehow have a vital link; while the third involves the search for something of enduring value springing up in a world where everything on the surface is appearing and disappearing.

The plain man and the poet are at one in feeling that what matters in Time is not the first, but the last, not the beginning, but the end. This is the fundamental reason underlying the simple-minded wish for 'a happy ending.' And the prophets support the poets and the plain men. 'Let the dead past bury its dead.' 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' This is the same note, only deeper, as we hear in Meredith's line, 'Thou art thy future, not thy past,' and in Dante's sigh over 'sorrow's crown of sorrow.' It means the whole difference between Hope and Regret. And yet this obvious fact, on which all practical life

ends and all the thrill of drama and story is overlooked by
st philosophies. They assume that the relation of the Future
the Present is, in quality, just the same as the relation of the
t. The difference is merely one of position; it is only that
Future comes later and the Past came earlier in the series, as
ugh the moments of Time were nothing better than a row of
iard balls and it did not matter from which end we began.

And this leads to the second question: Why should we
pose that the flux of Time in which we are all immersed is a
re series of separate moments? Probably the reverse is the
th, and the Present Moment vitally connected with every
ıer both in the Past and in the Future. Its connexion with
se in the Future is different from its connexion with those in
Past, but it is a connexion all the same. Now this is certainly
sort of belief we all act on in ordinary life: we do everything
ı an eye to the Future, and we know that everything we can
is, to some extent at least, fixed by the Past. The most vital
ments in our experience are those in which our whole past
ıracter, acting in the Present, flings itself forward to meet the
ture. These are also the vital moments for the imaginative
ter creating characters, whether as novelist, dramatist or epic
et. And it is in this sense, I believe, that the first of all critics,
stotle, urged his poets to remember the Unity of Time. He was
nking, it is true, of drama in the narrow sense of the word, and
conditions of the stage limit him—or he felt they limited
ı—to one brief closely-connected complex of actions which
ıld be taken in, so to speak, and, as he says, 'at a glance.'
t the essentials are the same even when the stage is not to be
ısidered at all, or when its conditions are disregarded.

We can see this if we compare three works which we may take
typically modern: Ibsen's *Doll's House*, *Mrs. Dalloway*, by
ginia Woolf, and the great phantasmagoria that fills the bulk
Goethe's Second Part to *Faust*. *The Doll's House* is an admir-
e model of construction on strictly Aristotelian principles: the
es of actions can be taken in at a glance and summed up in the
swer to the question, 'What will Nora do when her Doll's
use is broken, when she realises that her husband will not help
out of the tangle into which she has got through her childish
orance of life?' And Ibsen handles the problem so that, step
step, what the characters do and say throws a full light on
ir unrepresented past and lets us forecast in some measure
ir future. It is just the same method that was used, though
an infinitely greater genius, in Sophocles' masterpiece, *Œdipus
King*. There the question is, 'How will Œdipus handle the
ıation when his city is cursed and he discovers that he himself
the unconscious culprit?' The process of the action, which,

even in real life, could only have lasted a few hours, does reveal to us the whole nature of the man in the past, and how he ran his head into the terrible net that has caught him, and how he has the greatness of character that will in some measure surmount it.

Ibsen, like Sophocles, does not in *The Doll's House* go beyond action and the speech possible to action. But the modern novelist and the modern poet can avail themselves of much more than action, and they take their opportunities. Virginia Woolf in *Mrs. Dalloway* has, it is true, limited herself strictly to one day, but she has allowed herself full scope in entering without disguise, as a novelist should enter, into the hearts and memories of her characters, and, beyond this, she has set side by side people who never even speak to each other, but whose lives touch each other suddenly, closely, even mortally. Mrs. Dalloway, charming, good and brilliant, the wife of a man whom, up to a point, she has loved, and who deserves her love, the mother of an exquisite daughter just growing up, gives a party, and at the party there may be, and there is, a former lover. In that one day she realises what has been growing within her for years, the knowledge that she has married the wrong man, that her love is dying of inefficiency, that the pith has gone out of her existence, that she has no longer the inward fire which could make her face life and exult in death. And this mortal knowledge is driven home to her, not only by the meeting with her former lover, but by the chance remark of one of her guests about an ex-soldier who has killed himself in an outburst of insane despair. This assault from Time reveals the weakness of her inner defences. And the intensity of the assault is made perceptible to the reader by the vivid pictures of the terrors and delusions surging through the mind of the soldier unknown to Mrs. Dalloway, terrors and delusions near enough to all our own fears and weaknesses for us to sympathise with them while they bear the very stamp of madness. The surface of Time for the modern individual in its breadth, as in its flux, is given here with a startling power. Only the question of the Future is left blurred and indistinct, and this perhaps is the one criticism to be made on a most remarkable and finely finished work: all we feel for certain is that after that one evening nothing can be the same for Mrs. Dalloway any longer.

Still more noticeable in its divergence from the classical model in externals and its compliance with the same model in essentials is the 'Helena' in the Second Part of *Faust*. Goethe's theme was that of a modern man who, desiring with all his force to develop the best that is in him, realises that he can never do this until he has grasped for himself in mind and heart all that was of permanent value in the Greek conception of harmonious life. And once he has done that, once he has sunk himself in

this dream of the Past, he finds a spirit born of it driving him back again into the workaday world of the Present. There is real and a deep unity in this conception, and a unity which, as Goethe said himself, 'is a Unity of Time in the higher sense.' The modern mind, when it enters actively on its inheritance, does hold an immense store of what has come to it from a Past befor its birth. There are moments, and those among the most important of its life, when it can only grow by commerce with this Past if it is to be of any practical use in the Future. In Goethe' drama the process and result of this inner union was symbolise by a device of his own. Faust is spirited to Hellas on Mayday night, and there wins Persephone's consent to woo the shade of Helen for his love. By subtle touches in the poetry we are reminded incessantly that Faust's experiences, exciting and transforming as they are, are yet not actions in the ordinary sense of the word. They are the dreams of a seeker:

Dreams are they, dreams or memories?

Goethe was here, although in a manner entirely his own, anticipating some of the most significant efforts to-day, efforts at representing the cluttered content of the modern mind when it is faced with the most characteristic and pressing of its problems about life. The modern man cannot escape being the heir of the ages; and this brings him both wealth and bewilderment. I: imaginative artists are to present him truly at his most critical moments, they will present him with his mind haunted by echoe: of the Past as well as by the insistent appeals of the unborn Future. It is typical of our period that a modern poet shoulc have flooded *The Waste Land* with streams of quotations. The same feeling, though in a lighter vein, runs through Mrs. Woolf' *Orlando*, the sense of the long inheritance down the centuries that may come to life in a modern being, the men of the Past reincarnated in a woman, the women in a man.

The fulness and variety of modern consciousness appear in another form. Layer on layer of impressions are felt to be crowding together, all of them pressing for recognition—some vague, some vivid, some important, some trivial. It is a constant preoccupation of our novelists to give the sense of this full-charge stream, smooth on the surface, turbid below, rushing ceaselessly forward whether to cataracts or to peace. To a certain extent, no doubt, every imaginative writer dealing with human characte has tried to do this. But to nothing like the same extent. And in earlier attempts it has usually been done indirectly, not, as now, by describing the surge of perception travelling through one particular mind. The massive sweep of human life in the *Iliad* owes little to self-analysis, the actual scene is crowded and the

poet is content with drawing the chief characters strongly enough to let the listener imagine for himself, at least in outline, the inner effect of the constant movement, a movement that scarcely rests at all, and by its fatefulness and significance illuminates both the past and the future of the men and women who make and are made by it. The action of the *Iliad* lasts only a few days, but the implications of it embrace years.

A similar method, almost always indirect, but hardly ever ineffective, is typical of the Elizabethan drama. The dance at the house of Capulet in *Romeo and Juliet* heaps bundle after bundle of impressions upon the spectator, and indirectly we realise how complex is the experience of Romeo, aware at once of the light brilliance in the company round him, the fussy hospitality of his testy host, the risk of the whole adventure when the underlying feud is all but ablaze, while through it all his passion for Rosaline, which he had fancied overmastering, is now slipping away faster than he can comprehend before the new passion for Juliet. But the effect of this complexity is gained, as it were, from the outside. What Romeo says himself—and he says little here—is taken up with the main drift of his thoughts. There is scarcely a touch of self-analysis, though Romeo is fond of analysing himself. If we contrast this with almost any scene of a party in Proust's astounding novel, we find ourselves in a world where analysis of the inner feelings is the essential matter. Proust hardly tells us a thing that any of his characters say without telling us also why they said it, how much else they were thinking of as they were saying it, and, usually, how little they meant it. It is like the difference between floating on the surface of a great stream with the sky above us and being sunk under the water itself with all the strangeness and horror of the new experience. Certainly no writer has ever given so vividly the sense of the current of Time, the crowded and continual movement carrying so much that is trivial, and somehow, even in that triviality, so much that is arresting and enchaining. It is partly for this reason that he makes so strong an appeal to modern writers. Nothing is more characteristic of them than the determination to face the whole of life and leave nothing out, however commonplace, mean, sordid or repellent. To get the very movement of life as they find it, that is their aim of aims.

Along with this keen sense of the lapse in Time goes inevitably a sense keener than ever of the pathos in the disappearance of the Past. Again, no doubt, this sense has been universal for all poets from the days of Homer and Ecclesiastes downwards. The trees put on another birth in the spring, but the generations of men are gone like the leaves that fell in the autumn. The silver cord must be loosed and the golden bowl broken. The days will

come when the grasshopper is a burden. But Proust brings to the analysis of old age and its progress all his merciless insight and all the horrible power that baffled desire may awaken in a craving temperament, if that temperament belongs to a genius. Even more horrible is the dissection of a dying love, if love is the proper name to give to a passion which aims at nothing but possession, so horrible and so powerful that to travel with Proust under the waters of Time is to travel in a Hell as appalling as Dante's, and even more sinister because less dignified.

Yet, if this were all, I doubt if I should have referred to Proust for the purpose of this paper. Something else runs through the book, the desire for the permanent and the eternal, the hope, faint, but strangely persistent, that in some way this is attainable. It is significant that the title of the whole huge work is 'The Search for the Past,' but the close of it is called 'The Finding of the Past.' Here, once more, it may be said, and, indeed, should be said, we have a repetition in a new form of what has haunted poets in every age. The gods are immortal if man is not, and there are men whom they take for their own and bring to the Islands of the Blest. Moreover, as the world advances, more and more the poets, and the imaginative writers generally, come to insist that this eternity of their desire is somehow bound up with the Time that seems so fleeting. How it can be so bound up they do not profess to explain, but the sense of the union is the spring for their most characteristic utterances, extravagant, even, in the effort to express what is perhaps inexpressible. To Keats the nightingale is 'immortal,' a bird 'not born for death'; to Shelley the skylark is not a bird at all, but a spirit at the gates of heaven. What is the meaning of this, if not that in some way the permanent can well up in the transitory, eternity in time? And it is the same hope that makes so many who are not poets turn with eagerness to any philosophy, whether they can understand it or not, which, like the writings of Bergson or the theories of Einstein, at least suggests that the ordinary way of looking at Time as something that comes, goes, and is for ever gone is not the whole truth about the matter.

But closer to the plain man than these abstruse speculations are the works of imagination, especially the imagination of a novelist, because his themes are drawn expressly from daily life. And thus it is of extreme interest to see how a novelist of genius like Proust, perverted, but still a genius, addresses himself to the quest. He finds what he wants in that imaginative power of the artist which can recognise across a gulf of Time the essential quality of a reiterated impression, the link of identity which unites the Past and the Present, and which, experienced for however brief a part of Time, lifts the man above its limitations. There must be

something more in him than what is carried away incessan the lapsing of events if he can in this fashion grasp the ess likeness of two things, one present and the other past. minute freed from the bondage of time sets free the man feels it.' 'Une minute affranchie de l'ordre du temps a rec nous pour la sentir l'homme affranchi de l'ordre du temps,' *Le Temps Retrouvé*, at the beginning of the last volume).

In this power is a sign and seal of the real self. The sel have seemed dead, but when it recognises the truth of across the current of Time it 'awakes and lives again, fed b celestial food that it has found.' The food is celestial beca is true, and, so Proust appears to think, it is only througl comparison between Present and Past, through this recogniti something 'common to both and much more significant either,' that man can attain to truth. When he is immers the Present he is far too much occupied with his selfish inte he cannot see the thing as it is and rejoice in its real characte essence is veiled from him by his own petty concern with it speaks to him by the impressions it produces on him, bu cannot understand the meaning of those impressions until h them, or, rather, feels them, with the detachment of a man lo back on his past.

Hence Proust's extraordinary insistence on analysing detail of sentient life as it drifts through the mind and yet never leave the mind. Always he is exultant over this p and sometimes exultant enough to speak as though it could man from the fear of death. If he can thus rise above Time should he fear the future? ('Situé hors du temps, que pour craindre de l'avenir?') Then this confidence passes: moments when the artist seems to be, indeed is, beyond do not themselves endure; 'the contemplation, though a templation of eternity, is itself fugitive.' None the less, moments give the writer his 'one real and fruitful joy' i through this power of lifting him consciously above wh fleeting and in and through that lifting showing him the tru

Mr. Clive Bell, to whose brilliant little book on Proust article must acknowledge itself indebted, speaks of Proust philosopher, and disparages the connexion with Bergson, Pro 'intellectual master' and relative by marriage, that may un this way he has of looking at things. But a man may be philosopher' and yet on the right track in philosophy, v right or wrong, the view is undeniably stimulating. All the so because of its remarkable, if limited, likeness to the creed very different writer and a very much greater and saner Goethe. Goethe, too, had a vivid sense of the flux of Time of men as borne down by its flood, and Goethe, too, held fa

he conviction that through Art and Thought they could lift hemselves above the waters, finding, through the power of poetry, deathlessness — not a deathlessness of glory or any trash of hat sort, but the deathlessness of active truth and love. The fuses may be trusted :

> They keep their promise when they sing of
> A deathlessness to find,
> They store the Meaning in the heart
> And the Form in the mind.

The words 'heart' and 'love' mark a difference between roethe and Proust at least as important as the likeness. To roethe love was vital even for the understanding of any one hing. 'We cannot learn to know a thing unless we love it.' fore than this, love was vital for the completion both of the niverse and of man. Both of them were growing, and love was he spring and crown of the process, cosmic and personal. Love ras in and behind and beyond the fugitive appearances of Time : initiated all that was of value in them, and it led them to their oal. But to Proust a man's love, for all its intensity and allure-nent, is nothing but another illusion : the joy that he heard romised by great music, 'noble, clear, ineffable,' had nothing to o with love. That was reserved simply for understanding. Ience the aridity and desolation of his monumental book, in pite of the wonderful figures of 'Grand'mère' and 'Maman,' rho do love unselfishly. What has happened to this man, the eader asks, dowered so richly with insight, sensitiveness and reative power ; what has happened to twist him into this per-erted view, blind him in his search for the doors of escape ? One, it is true, he has opened, the door to the understanding of vil, but he only hears echoes from the others. He gives the lie o Shakespeare when Shakespeare speaks in his own person, not s the murderer Macbeth. Love, Proust says almost in so nany words, *is* 'Time's fool,' is *not* 'the star to every wandering ark,' shining beyond the seaman's comprehension, though guide the ship's course, 'Whose worth's unknown, although his eight be taken.'

Proust's 'hero' excuses himself for faithlessness in love ecause his own qualities alter, and so, he argues, he himself lters. But there is a philosophy of love profounder and closer the plain man's intuition, a philosophy which recognises that ove deals with personality and that personality is more than any undle of qualities. It is the source of those qualities, expressed them partly, but not wholly, and true love grasps the per-onality. 'These are her gifts,' the poet says :

as tongue may tell them o'er.
Speak low her name, my soul, for that says more.

In grasping this 'more,' the lover grasps a formative po the universe, an enduring force which makes men, and why true love has always been thought of as eternal:

Who ever loved that did not love for ever?

If this be error, and upon me proved
I never writ, nor no man ever loved.

That is why crimes and pettinesses are, in a sense, irrele love of the true quality. They can make the lover miserab that is a different matter.

There is a second way of escape, one which Proust touches at all, and this is the more surprising because sensitive and instructed taste. It is the way of beauty. real artist has at bottom the conviction that in making som beautiful he is also making something truer and deepe appears on the surface of ugly appearances. And if he be analyse what he means by 'truer' and 'deeper,' he usuall that he means something permanent, something beyor fleetingness which at first sight is all that we can see. Of it is not mere permanence that the artist desires, it is perm of something glorious, but my point here is the artist's beli in his vision permanence is an essential element.

Now there is a theory of Beauty which, whatever its and limitations, does take serious account of this belief. I theory that Beauty is another of the formative influences universe, working in ways beyond our comprehension, b eluding entirely our apprehension. It has the power, working freely, of making every detail absolutely satisfy itself, and also absolutely essential to the whole of which part. The spirit of man, when it sees this Beauty in the cannot understand and put into words the causes of his faction; it springs from a source deeper than his logic can but it comforts his whole mind because it speaks of a ha which, in its way also, his intellect desires. Natural suggests for its explanation a something sublime which c appearances, and is more enduring than they can be. A same Power, according to this theory, is working in the c artist, though with individual differences. The artist is new forms of beauty other than could ever appear in Natu his belief that he is making something permanent is ju because he is dealing with the same lasting principle working in Nature itself, and his works, if he makes them pr are *discoveries of infinitudes.* They may be slight or the be huge, for there are small infinitudes as well as large.

matters is to get through appearances to the power that produces them.

Virginia Woolf has been chosen for this paper as typically and finely modern, and it may end appropriately with a mention of two points in what is perhaps her subtlest book, *To the Lighthouse*. For they touch directly on our subject. She gives, it is true, no hint that she would accept any philosophy of the kind here very crudely roughed out, but few prose writers have expressed with so much terseness, delicacy, and intensity the artist's passion to grasp that which endures throughout change. The painter, Lily Briscoe, is tormented by the struggle to achieve this, to drop all the trivial concerns of life and encounter 'this other thing, this truth, this reality, which suddenly laid hands on her, emerged stark at the back of appearances, and commanded her attention.'

It is even more interesting to find a writer who understands so intimately this strenuous and lonely search of the artist perceiving that it corresponds, closely and deeply, with the power that certain elect spirits possess of making a unity in the trivial things of ordinary life by the human gifts of a sympathy which, plunging into the chaotic drift of littlenesses, lifts out of them something permanent. Lily Briscoe, wrestling with her painter's vision on the shore that looks towards the lighthouse, and remembering, with a poignancy into which the reader has been made to enter, the bitter lapse of what had once been lovely, remembering, moreover, the irritating flux of perpetual detraction and disparagement, remembers also, and above all, the dead Mrs. Ramsay who could unite and bring together for a wonderful unending moment on the seashore two human beings who had done nothing but exasperate each other.

> But what power was in the human soul! she thought. That woman sitting there, writing under the rock, resolved everything into simplicity; made these angers, irritations fall off like old rags; she brought together this and that and then this, and so made out of that miserable silliness and spite (she and Charles squabbling, sparring, had been silly and spiteful) something—this scene on the beach, for example, this moment of friendship and liking—which survived, after all these years, complete, so that she dipped into it to refashion her memory of him, and it stayed in the mind almost like a work of art.

Here, in this tiny memory and in default of the great revelation which had never come to her, Lily finds one of the

> little daily miracles, illuminations, matches struck unexpectedly in the dark; here was one. This, that, and the other; herself and Charles Tansley and the breaking wave; Mrs. Ramsay bringing them together; Mrs. Ramsay saying 'Life stand still here'; Mrs. Ramsay making of the moment something permanent (as in another sphere Lily herself tried to make of the moment something permanent)—this was of the nature of a

revelation. In the midst of chaos there was shape; this eternal pas and flowing (she looked at the clouds going and the leaves shaking) struck into stability.

Here, and finally, we come once more in touch with Goe To Goethe it was precisely the business of man thus to make moment eternal:

Er kann dem Augenblick
Dauer verleihen.

He could do this, so Goethe believed, following Spinoza interpreting him in a poet's way, because every moment wa fragmentary manifestation of a divine pl a runni through Time, and with this plan, this 'Idea,' h could operate c sciously and rejoicingly, although he could never full w it was. He saw enough to work by, and, working by it, he co say with authority to the Moment, 'Stay yet a little while, tl art so fair!' In that lies the significance of the famous w between Faust and the Devil. The Devil bets that he can m Faust believe it possible to give this command in his serv The Devil fails, and was bound to fail unless he could blindl the man's spirit.

Readers of our Poet Laureate's latest and greatest work, gospel of Beauty, his legacy of greeting and worship to the gl visible and invisible, of this world, will be aware of how he, t strikes the same full chord, combining in one organ roll of maje music the sense of human love and of the lovelinesses that dep for their very existence on the passing sequence of temp events, but all of them singing of something more than temp as we understand, and very imperfectly understand, that perfect word. For Robert Bridges 'first Love' is

as the oceantide of the omnipotent Pleasur of God,
flushing all avenues of life, and unawares
by thousandfold approach forestalling its full flood
with divination of the secret contacts of Love,—
of faintest ecstacies aslumber in Nature's calm,
like thought in a closed book, where some poet long since
sang his throbbing passion to immortal sleep—with coy
tendernesses delicat as the shifting hues
that sanctify the silent dawn with wonder-gleams,
whose evanescence is the seal of their glory,
consumed in self-becoming of eternity;
till every moment as it flyeth, cryeth "Seize!
Seize me ere I die! I am the Life of Life."[1]

F. MELIAN STAWELL

[1] *The Testament of Beauty*, by Robert Bridges. Reproduced by kind permis of the Poet Laureate and the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

ROCK

COMPANY L

NE, LONDON, W

[illegible] 1930 [illegible]

[illegible]

MARCH No. [illegible] Vol. [illegible]

LONDON: CONTEMPORARY [illegible] ORANGE STREET, LEICESTER SQUARE, W.C.2

[illegible] NEW YORK: [illegible]

[illegible] 3/- [illegible] 30/- (Postpaid), Post [illegible]

[illegible]

THE

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER



No. DCXXXVII—March 1930

THE NAVAL CONFERENCE OF 1930

It was at St. Louis on February 3, 1916, that President Wilson made his momentous pronouncement of the new naval policy which was intended to safeguard 'genuine' neutrality against German submarine warfare and against the Allied blockade. Congress voted the funds for the 1916 programme, which started on its way impelled by what may be called a 'neutrality motive.'

America entered the war; her fleet grew steadily bigger, till in 1919, when the Versailles Conference opened, its shadow loomed darkly across the Atlantic. It became a formidable obstacle to the peace negotiations. In March 1919, at Paris, Mr. Walter Long, the First Lord of the Admiralty, expressed his alarm to Mr. Daniels and stated that Mr. Lloyd George could not support the idea of a League of Nations unless the United States would agree to cut the big naval programme.[1]

Lord Robert Cecil was equally perturbed, and on April 8, 1919, wrote to Colonel House urging abandonment on the plea

[1] *America's Naval Challenge*: Frederick Moore (1929), pp. 26[illegible]

that a competition in armaments between the two chief supporters of the League must doom it to complete sterility or worse.[2]

France supported the League of Nations on the definite understanding that the United States and Great Britain would guarantee the security of France. The Senate rejected the League, and France did not receive the guarantee of security, which still haunts her and remains the basis of her demands.

There followed the Washington Conference of 1921,[3] where Mr. Hughes dropped a bombshell by making a definite and concrete proposal for the destruction of a number of specific ships. To say that the French were not pleased[4] at the Conference is a mild statement of their feelings. But the American proposals were sound and practical. The aim of the United States was parity, and when the Conference ended the American people thought that it had been achieved in all classes of ships. This was not the case. A definite proposal had been presented by the United States to limit the total tonnage of cruisers and destroyers to 450,000 tons for the United States and Great Britain, but a thorny discussion on submarines intervened and the whole question was shelved; Earl Balfour made a statement[5] accepting parity in the battlefleet, but adding a phrase which appeared to include cruisers, but did not actually do so.

The Conference ended with parity in battleships with Great Britain and the ratio (5—5—3—1½—1½) for the five Powers. It limited the size of the individual cruiser to 10,000 tons (10,160 tons metric) and its guns to 8 inches (206 millimetres). The United States proceeded to scrap twenty-eight battleships (fifteen building and thirteen old ones), and Great Britain followed suit with twenty built and four building. This was a big achievement, but it left France dissatisfied with the ratio allotted to her.[6]

Great Britain and Japan proceeded, not too wisely, as one can now see, to design and lay down 10,000-ton cruisers. By 1926 they were both definitely superior to the United States in this class. Suddenly America woke up to the fact that they had only two 10,000-ton cruisers against the British eleven and Japanese six, and all the naval geysers there began spouting hot and cold.

[2] *America's Naval Challenge*: Frederick Moore (1920), p. 30.

[3] See *The Times*, November 18, 1921.

[4] Mark Sullivan, *Great Adventure*, p. 100.

[5] *Brassey's Annual*, 1928, p. 67: 'Taking these two, the battleships themselves *and the vessels auxiliary and necessary to the battle fleet*, we think that the proportion between the various countries is acceptable.'

[6] See articles on 'French Naval Policy' by Paul Chack in *Brassey* (1928) and 'Evolution of French Navy' by Lieutenant Guichard in *Brassey* (1930), both well-known French naval writers.

Briefly, a large body of opinion thought that America had been tricked out of parity. The President, resorting once more to his constitutional armoury, proposed another Conference, where another attempt could be made to lay the grim spectre of competitive armaments. France and Italy sent polite refusals, but Great Britain, the United States, and Japan met at Geneva on June 20, 1927. It was found difficult to reconcile the different views. The United States wanted twenty-five 10,000-ton cruisers, which seemed to Great Britain too many; Great Britain asked for a tonnage in cruisers, destroyers, and submarines of 590,000 tons, which seemed to the United States too much. America wanted size (8-inch guns) rather than numbers; Great Britain wanted numbers (6-inch) rather than size. The Conference came to no conclusion and broke up in August 1927.[7]

The Conferences, both at Washington and Geneva, were dominated by the idea of parity, which in its turn rested on the belief of America in maritime power and in its determination that the word 'neutrality' should have a definite meaning. This may be called the 'parity approach,' and it was hampered by the view that parity, unlike charity, should begin at the other person's home. Meanwhile the League of Nations was approaching the question of disarmament along a different road.

The Preparatory Committee

For seven years it had been busy with the question. In its councils France pinned her faith to the word 'security,' seeking, so to speak, to pool the security of the world in a great collective pact of mutual obligations. The Protocol of 1924[8] is a product of this school of thought. Round it gathered a whole jargon of its own in terms of 'graduated obligations' and 'regional pacts' which, under new names, are closely akin to the old pattern of group alliances. They are the same breed of dog with a new name. Peace is to be maintained by the menace of war.

It is the business, however, of the League to discover some path to disarmament, and it is for ever seeking some formula that will reconcile disarmament with security. Elaborate questionnaires have been framed for the purpose, and in the thorny region of their technicalities one may wander for days and years. On the road lie the remains of the Permanent Advisory Committee, the Temporary Mixed Commission, and all sorts of minor resolutions.

Finally, in December 1925, there was constituted by the Council of the League the Preparatory Committee for the Dis-

[7] For story of Geneva Conference see *Brassey's Naval Annual*, 1928.

[8] *League of Nations, Fifth Assembly*, November 2, 1924, in British Cmd. 2273 of 1924.

armament Conference.[9] It was constantly being pestered to get on with its work.

In July 1928 the British and French Governments agreed to a proposed basis for discussion in which 10,000-ton cruisers were to be subject to limitation.[10] The American Press obtained the terms of the proposal and published them (September 21, 1928). An immense outcry arose in America against any restriction on the 10,000-ton cruisers that she wanted. Later came a frank note from the United States. The distinction between classes of cruisers was rejected. The Preparatory Committee in 1928 had run into the wreck of the Geneva Conference of 1927. One side was seeking for Parity by means of conference, the other for Security *vid* the League of Nations.

To clear the line there came the Kellogg Pact signed at Paris on August 27, 1928, in which all the leading Powers renounced war 'as an instrument of national policy.' It was followed by the American Cruiser Bill, providing for fifteen new cruisers and an aircraft carrier, which was signed by the President on February 13, 1929. Of 8-inch gun cruisers built and building previous to its passage the United States had eight, Great Britain fifteen, and Japan eleven. In April 1929 the Preparatory Commission met again to endeavour once more to discover a formula that would reconcile disarmament and security. One of the questions constantly revolving round and round was that of global tonnage *versus* categories—in other words, whether naval strength should be measured in terms of the total tonnage of all ships or in terms of so many individual battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. This question depends largely on the functions performed by these different classes. Each nation has its own ideas on the values of the different classes, but the Preparatory Committee is hampered by the idea, strong at Geneva, that one can be secure from war only when each is stronger than his neighbour. The problem is closely associated with the relative functional values of the different classes of ships.

BATTLESHIPS

The three principal maritime Powers are already pledged by the Washington Conference to a specific relative strength (15—15—9) in battleships, but this involves heavy expenditure in replacing the older ships. The British Government's proposals of February 7, 1930, express a wish 'that battleships will in due time disappear altogether, as it considers them a very doubtful proposition in view of their size and cost and of the efficiency of

[9] Met in First Session May 18, 1926.
[10] Cmd. 3211, 1928, p. 34.

air and submarine attack.' In the meantime it suggests that the question of their replacement should be deferred for the consideration of a further Conference in 1935, and that new battleships should in any case be limited to 25,000 tons. Further, it suggests advancing the normal scrapping programme by adding to it five of the British, three of the American, and one of the Japanese older battleships.

In view of America's pronouncement to go as far in reductions as the strongest Power, of Italy's readiness to consider the abolition of the capital ship, and of the principal Japanese delegate's statement in favour of battleship reduction, it seems curious that the British Government, whilst expressing a wish to see the large battleship disappear, should have put forward no big concrete proposal on the subject. It is probably swayed in this matter by naval opinion, which is opposed to the abolition of the large ship. Naval opinion, however, is not infallible, and the conventional view of the professional man may very well be wrong. A battleship merely represents the ultimate expression of fighting power that can be put into one ship. Her task of holding the ring against *corresponding* ships can be done just as effectually by smaller ships, which have, as a matter of fact, fought actions even more decisive than the larger ones. At Trafalgar the largest ship was about 1200 tons; at the Yalu (China and Japan), 7000; at Tsushima (Russia and Japan), 15,000; and at Jutland, 30,000. The continual growth in size has arisen, not from any functional necessity, but solely from rivalry and competition.

The introduction of the 'Dreadnought' type by Lord Fisher illustrates the process. After expending enormous sums on these leviathans and super-leviathans the relative strength of the German and British navies remained practically unaltered. If those two countries had agreed in 1900 to limit their warships to 6000 tons their relative power in 1914 would have been much the same.

On the other hand, though submarines, aircraft, and mines have greatly limited the activities and uses of the large battleship, they do not, and probably never will by themselves, justify its abolition. So long as one side possesses them the other must follow suit. They represent the necessity of a concentrated force. This is the backbone of naval war, and no one can doubt that if the British battle fleet had been defeated in the late war the Allied cause must have collapsed like a house of cards.

It is the principle of limitation in size, and not the submarine nor aircraft, that has doomed the large ship. After the war we built the *Hood*, of 45,000 tons, and had plans ready for much larger ships, costing immense sums. At Washington a purely arbitrary limitation of 35,000 tons was accepted, and the number

of battleships was cut down by about 50 per cent. At Geneva we suggested reducing the maximum tonnage to 30,000, and now the Government suggests a still further reduction to 25,000 tons. Is there any magical virtue in this figure to prevent its further reduction ?

The larger ship, if larger ships are built, does unquestionably protect the smaller cruising ship from the enemy's larger ship. But remove it from the board and the cruiser then becomes the ultimate expression of tactical power and takes on herself the functions of the battleship. Even the humble torpedo-boat destroyer can effectually control a particular area until something more powerful appears over the horizon, and in a war between two countries possessing nothing larger, would fulfil the *rôle* of the battleship, just as the *Mimi* and *Fifi*, two little motor launches, commanded Lake Tanganyika in 1916.

There is, however, a limit in the downward scale. Vessels are required with sufficient sea-going qualities and fuel endurance to keep the seas for a reasonable period and to operate in the oceanic spaces. They must also have sufficient speed and gun power to protect the trade and transport routes from raiders and enemy warships. All these qualities can be combined in a vessel of 6000 tons, of which the British *Delhi* class may be taken as an example and certainly in a vessel of 10,000 tons.[11]

Maximum tonnage of all ships might be reduced to that figure by stopping all replacements of larger ships and scrapping them as they reached the age limit, and an agreement on these lines would not endanger the security of any Power.

A concentrated force as the backbone of naval war would still be necessary, but would consist of ships of 10,000 tons carrying 8-inch guns. Naval expenditure would be greatly reduced, and a number of small ships now engaged in protecting monster battleships would be set free to protect trade.

At the back of the big battleship is the big battleship designer, who is constantly seeking after the will-o'-the-wisp of absolute immunity. When after the war a battleship of 50,000 tons was projected to cost 10,000,000*l.* this was given as the lowest possible tonnage on which immunity from submarines and mines could be obtained. Precisely the same argument is now put forward for the 25,000-ton ship. The expert who believes in size and weight must face the fact that if we endeavour by heavy expenditure to build something very special in 25,000 tons others will do the same and we shall come round again to the same point. The present commotion has all arisen from the technical expert trying to do something special in the line of 10,000-ton

[11] See 'Capital Ships,' by Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond, K.C.B., *The Times*, November 22, 1929.

cruisers, with the result that America started a competition in that type. This is a hard, stony, and expensive road. Defence is necessary, but we must endeavour to eliminate from it the sulphurous element of rivalry.

A certain section of naval opinion is, however, so enamoured of expense that it actually states that a smaller ship must be made so perfect that it will be very expensive. The abolition of the large ship is apparently to involve an enormous expenditure in smaller ones. In other words, a small navy is to cost as much as a large one! The argument does not hold water. The exceptional cost of the German 'pocket battleship' *Ersatz Preussen* is simply due to the severe limitations placed on German construction by the Treaty of Versailles. They are allowed to have only one ship, and so they put a large sum into it.

The construction of this ship does, however, show that any agreement for limiting size of ships and calibre of guns must either be extended to all countries, or signatory Powers must be allowed to retain a number of heavily gunned ships to deal with the corresponding ships of non-signatory Powers.

The foregoing may be summarised by saying that the size of the capital ship is entirely a relative question, and that the cult of enormous size and the tendency to accept the infallibility of experts on this subject are twin fetishes mutually supporting and assisting one another in maintaining the naval expenditure of the world at its present high level.

Cruisers

The number and size of battleships are governed by the battle-fleet strength of possible opponents, but the number and size of cruisers mainly depend on the interests they have to defend. As this country is more dependent on oversea trade than any other, there is a strong logical argument for British superiority in this category. But relatively to the United States two other factors have to be considered. First, America is determined to have parity, and parity is essential to any agreement. Secondly, by placing an embargo on her exports and stopping our Canadian and Mexican trade she could strike a blow against this country which all the cruisers in the world could not parry.

America on two occasions in her history has been dragged into war by high-handed interference with her ships, contrary to the accepted conventions of international law. Lord Balfour's statement at Washington that he accepted parity was construed by Americans to mean parity in all classes of ships. This is an entirely reasonable demand, and, whether reasonable or not, is going to be fulfilled. We may have parity if we like, and if we

do not like we can whistle for it. There remains, however, Continental considerations. The Pact should be one, not of parity alone, but of parity and security. Any agreement on cruiser tonnage should permit of alteration in the event of a serious deterioration in the international situation, subject to a year's notice being given to America, so that she might proceed to lay down an equal number.

Destroyers and Submarines

The destroyer is really a small cruiser required for purposes of torpedo attack and defence with the battle fleet, for anti-submarine duties and the protection of trade in the terminal areas. The British proposal for 200,000 tons seems to be reasonable, subject to reductions if submarine programmes are curtailed. In order to obtain parity in destroyers America will have to scrap about 90,000 tons.

The submarine question will be much more difficult to re-solve. The British and American desire to see it abolished is presumably based on the German campaign against merchantmen in the late war.

But it remains a perfectly legitimate weapon, and moreover a very powerful weapon when used legitimately against warships. The British note of February 7 states that 'in war conditions it is a weapon of attack.' But are not battleships, cruisers, and destroyers weapons of attack? Certainly the submarine attack on the *Leon Gambetta* in April 1915 successfully defended the Adriatic, for the French fleet never entered it again. Similarly, the entry of a submarine into the Mediterranean in 1915 successfully defended the Dardanelles from the *Queen Elizabeth's* guns, for it sent her hurrying home with all despatch. Again, the submarine attack on the *Nottingham* and *Falmouth* on August 1916 helped to defend the High Sea Fleet from Lord Jellicoe's pursuit. The smaller naval Powers are fully aware of these facts. Their history is before them in our own official Histories. They might, however, as suggested by the Italian Delegation, agree to the abolition of the submarine as a *quid pro quo* for the larger battleship. But even so there are a large number of small Powers [12] possessing submarines who are not represented at the Conference, and it would entail asking them to abolish their only naval weapon. To foreign Powers there is something in the British and American suggestions to abolish the submarine slightly reminiscent of the proposal of the bears that the bees should abolish their stings.

[12] Jugo-Slavia, Greece, Turkey, Poland, Finland, Peru. For the requirements of the smaller naval Powers, see 'Conference of Rome,' 1924 (*Brassey's Naval Annual* (1925), p. 44).

THE CONFERENCE

The final decisions on these knotty problems are still in abeyance and can only be gathered from the pronouncements in the Press. One of the most important of these is the French Memorandum,[13] which leans heavily towards Security as opposed to Parity. According to the French view the discussions at London are to be considered only as a basis for a further convention for the limitation of armaments. Mere ratios [14] do not permit of rational application—in other words, the Washington ratios cannot be regarded as a basis of relative naval strength. A close interdependence exists between armaments at sea and on land and in the air, and finally the French Government would take fully into account any guarantee for security against aggression on the basis of Article XVI. of the Covenant. But these difficulties, in the opinion of the French Government, are not insuperable, and it looks upon the Conference as paving the way *towards general negotiation.*

The objection to this outlook is that it is very difficult to make it anything more than an outlook. It is impossible to find a formula that will equate the period of service of an Italian conscript, the birth rate of Germany, the geographical position of Italy, and the height of the Alps with the tonnage of the latest French submarine. The American and British approach does at least get somewhere towards immediate disarmament, and the acknowledgment and assurance of America's claim to parity is an assurance also for the peace of the world. The French seem to be animated by a veritable passion for security, interpreting the word in the narrowest terms of howitzers, poison gas, aircraft, and prospects of war. The best security is the cultivation of friendly feelings. The meek will certainly inherit the earth in the end, if the strong men, in their search for security, persist in cutting one another's throats.

The Conference was opened on January 21 in the gallery of the House of Lords by His Majesty the King, whose speech was heard over the whole civilised globe—an achievement of science far surpassing its work in the production of instruments of war.

Two questions strove with one another on the agenda. On January 27 the French delegation desired to discuss the old problem of the measurement of strength by global tonnage or by categories of ships. The Italian delegation asked that the relative rates of strength should be taken first. The question of global tonnage was given precedence.[15]

[13] *The Times*, December 27, 1929.

[14] 'The unjust tyranny of mathematical formulæ,' M. Tardieu at Calais, February 1, 1930 (*The Times*, February 2).

[15] Third Plenary Session, January 30 (*The Times*, January 31).

The same day an official announcement was made that the orders for two new British 10,000-ton cruisers (the *Surrey* and *Northumberland*) had been cancelled. In the question of global tonnage *versus* categories of ships the Geneva compromise of M. Paul Boncour was accepted—namely, that tonnage should be divided into categories, with a subsequent limited power to transfer from one category to another after giving previous notice to other signatories.

In pursuance of an incorrigible Geneva tendency to manufacture jargon, this proposal to transfer allotted tonnage from one class of ship to another has been called the French 'transactional' proposal.

The categories suggested by France were [16]:

(1) Vessels exceeding 10,000 tons displacement or with guns of more than 8 inches.
(2) Light surface vessels with guns exceeding 6 inches.
(3) Light surface vessels with guns not exceeding 6 inches.
(4) Submarines.
(5) Aircraft carriers.
(6) Special vessels, minelayers, aircraft transports.

Those suggested by Great Britain were somewhat different, namely:

(1) Capital ships.
(2) Aircraft carriers.
(3) Cruisers (*a*) with guns of 8 inch or over; (*b*) with guns of 6 inch or under.
(4) Destroyers.
(5) Submarines.

The difference between these two classifications will no doubt be reconciled.

France apparently wishes to build up to a total tonnage of 724,000 tons by 1936. This may be compared with her total tonnage of 797,000 tons in 1914. Under the Washington Conference she was allotted a battleship tonnage of 175,000 tons. Her present situation is largely governed by her Naval Statute of 1924, which provided for a 'light ship' fleet of 390,000 tons to be completed by 1943, including 96,000 tons of large submarines and 30,000 tons of smaller ones. Of this about 45 per cent. is built or building.

The United States outlook has been expressed in an important pronouncement made by Mr. Stimson [17] on February 6, embody-

[16] *The Times*, February 1.

[17] This was not issued in its entirety (*The Times*, February 11).

ing the unanimous view of the delegation on the discussions with Great Britain and Japan. The United States look for:

(1) Immediate parity with Great Britain in every class of ship.

(2) In larger 10,000-ton cruisers the United States to have eighteen and Great Britain fifteen—an advantage of 30,000 tons; in smaller cruisers Great Britain to have 42,000 tons more, but leaving each country the option of duplicating exactly the other's cruiser fleet.

(3) In battleships the equalisation of the fleets in 1931 instead of in 1942.

(4) In destroyers and aircraft carriers an equality of tonnage.

(5) In submarines the lowest tonnage possible and in favour of their total abolition.

On February 7 the British Government followed suit with a statement [18] of its policy. The proposals offered were:

(1) Agreement not only by global tonnage, but on the size of individual ships in the various categories.

(2) It might be convenient to allow the transfer of a percentage of tonnage, but not a general transfer. It was opposed to transfer in regard to capital ships, aircraft carriers, and submarines. In the case of cruisers it would be ready to agree to transfer from the 8-inch class to the 6-inch class.

(3) The number of capital ships laid down at Washington (namely, 15—15—9) to be reached within eighteen months instead of in 1936.

(4) No replacement of ships before the next Conference in 1935.[19]

(5) A reduction in battleship size from 30,000 tons to 25,000 tons and of guns from 16-inch to 12-inch.

As Great Britain has now twenty capital ships and the United States eighteen, this proposal means the scrapping by Great Britain of five and by the United States of three capital ships.[20]

According to one report America is in favour of maintaining the right to build a battleship of the British *Rodney* type (nine 16-inch), which would give her in 16-inch guns thirty-three against the British eighteen. This report gave rise to a merry game of 'Dreadnought' arithmetic on both sides of the Atlantic,

[18] Cmd. 3485 (*The Times*, February 8).

[19] This would save the laying down of five ships costing probably some 7,000,000*l.* a-piece.

[20] The five oldest British are *Iron Duke*, *Marlborough*, *Emperor of India*, *Benbow*, and *Tiger*, and the three oldest United States ships are *Florida*, *Utah*, and *Arkansas*.

but any technical subtleties of this sort are probably well withi the power of reasonable settlement.

In capital ships France asks for 209,257 tons [21] by 193 which would increase her Washington ratio from 33 per cent. the American and British strength to about 47 per cent., and sh also offers to forego the replacement of 105,000 tons up to 193 if a naval 'holiday' is agreed to. Her demand amounts to some thing like one more battleship, and does not appear to b unreasonable.

In cruisers the French ask for ten 10,000-ton ships and a tota of 124,859 tons against their present strength of seven 10,000-to ships and present total of 136,963 tons.

The Japanese ask for a large cruiser tonnage of 126,000 [22] ton against the 180,000 tons of the United States, giving her a rati of 70 per cent.

The following are the tonnage proposals to date [23] of th British Empire, United States, France, and Japan :

TONNAGE PROPOSALS 1930

(Figures in brackets are number of ships)

	British Empire.	United States.	Japan.	France.
Battleships .	[15] 473,650	[15] 464,000	[9] [24]	209,267
Cruisers (large) .	[15] 146,000	[18] 180,000	126,000	124,850
Cruisers (6-inch).	192,000	149,000	100,000 }	258,297
Destroyers .	200,000	150,000	165,000 }	
Submarines .	63,320	82,000	78,500	99,629

One might seriously ask if, when all these figures have bee laboriously adjusted and finally added up, some wizard of rela tivity could not persuade everybody to make a further cut c 20 per cent. in every section. It might be possible with a portion c the money saved to start a school for European diplomacy, wher the old-world tricks of that trade might be unlearnt, a task ever more necessary than that of naval disarmament.

There remains the more difficult question of the abolition o submarines which was discussed at the Fourth Plenary Sessio opened on February 11.

[21] She has at present nine battleships of 194,544 tons.

[22] Includes two of 8800 tons.

[23] *The Times*, February 15.

[24] Japan has at present ten of 289,400 tons (*Brassey's Annual*, 1930, p. 309).

[25] One category in French system of classification.

The United States and Great Britain are both in favour of their total abolition on the ground that it is an offensive weapon. France and Japan are opposed to its abolition. On strictly logical grounds the terms 'offensive' and 'defensive' belong rather to the use of a weapon than to the weapon itself. Even a shield designed primarily for defence may become offensive if hurled at someone's head. On the other hand, the wholesale abolition of one class of vessel, notorious for its inhuman use in the late war, would register a great step forward in the cause of peace. Italy regards it as a useful weapon of defence, but is prepared to favour its abolition.

The strengths in submarines at present are:

	Built.	Building.	Total.
British Empire . .	53	10	63
United States . . .	122	5	127
Japan	64	7	71
France	52	47	99
Italy	53	14	67

France, which is building a large number, is in favour of the agreement signed at Washington in 1922 to regulate its use against merchant ships, which requires passengers and crew to be placed in safety before the ship is sunk.

It would be as well to lay down firmly that the submarine itself is not to be regarded as a place of safety, for many a man taken prisoner on a submarine had to suffer the danger of attack from British destroyers on his way home.

It is just as well, too, to grasp the fact that in France leading journalists, like Pertinax, regard the proposal as a piece of 'pharisaical policy' on the part of Great Britain and the United States, who desire on easy terms the naval hegemony of the world; they see even in the scrapping of battleships the British merely making a virtue of grim economic necessity. It is useless to combat this line of old-world thought. Such writers evidently do not grasp that in Great Britain and the United States there is a solid phalanx of opinion gradually crystallising against the immense place filled by the idea of war in the polity of nations. In the end of ends those who act in direct opposition to the strivings of these two great nations for the cause of peace may find themselves unable to wage war for lack of the supplies of war.

The best reply, perhaps, to these arguments would have been for Great Britain to offer a drastic reduction in battleship strength —say, to 10—10—6 for the United States, Great Britain, and

Japan. One might well offer, too, the abolition of that cumbersome expensive vessel the aircraft carrier, a monster of doubtful value which no one would have thought of building if we had not started it, and which in its turn requires cruisers and destroyers to protect its helplessness.

One thing is certain, that armament and disarmament have become questions of international polity, and even France, which is quite excusably the strongest exponent of the old mentality, clearly does not like to be left in diplomatic isolation as the principal advocate of the more drastic instruments of war.

The suicidal idea that countries can only ensure peace by being stronger than their neighbours is in itself a potent instigator of war. At bottom, no doubt, war is caused, not by armaments in themselves, but by bad faith and tricky diplomacy; but excessive armaments aggravate the strain and bring it more quickly to breaking point on any provocation. Competitive building is an encouragement to war and is maintained by a belief in war. It is precisely this attitude of mind that the Kellogg Pact is intended to disperse. If the London Conference does no more than abolish competition between the British Empire and the United States it will have done a great work by the removal of a virus of ill-will and suspicion, and it may open the way to an era of further disarmament and possibly to a new international outlook. In all civilised countries there is a growing current of opinion against the futility of war. Those who think that the best protection against a neighbour's birth rate is to be found in howitzers, aircraft, and poison gas are condemned to a fatal stupidity which all the military talent in the world can never mask. It is this fatal frame of mind which, perhaps, the London Conference, by bringing the great nations together in friendly deliberation, will do something to dispel.

The principal difficulty at present lies in the high tonnage demands of France in cruisers, destroyers and submarines, which give the British Empire a superiority in cruisers and destroyers of only about 5½ to 4 (538,000 tons to 383,147 tons), and in submarines an inferiority of 6 to 9. If Great Britain can feel secure with a French superiority in aircraft of something like 2 to 1, then France need not be disturbed by the idea of parity in submarine tonnage with Great Britain and by a British superiority in cruiser tonnage of, say, 2 to 1.

For practical purposes, the French policy amounts to this—that when Great Britain reaches an agreement with the United States on a level of parity and reduction, France puts forward demands, forcing Great Britain to put up her requirements to a point where America asks whether the Conference is for parity in disarmament or parity in increased armaments.

It can only be hoped that the British Empire will cling to General Dawes' motto of 'One thing at a time' and hold fast to parity with the United States, leaving France to do what she likes in her desire for impregnable security in the air, on land, at sea and under the sea, in contrast to Italy, who has shown a most reasonable and temperate attitude sincerely helpful to the cause of disarmament.

Armies and Navies may be an expression of greatness, but they do not in themselves constitute greatness.

> What constitutes a State?
> Not high raised battlements or laboured mound,
> *Thick walls or moated gate,*
> Not cities proud with towers and turrets crowned,
> Not bays and wide spread ports,
> Where, laughing at the storm, great navies ride;
> No—men, high-minded men.

K. G. B. Dewar.

THE INDIAN SCENE

The publication of the Simon Commission's Report, which is expected in the early months of this year, will act like the spotlight of a theatre and focus the attention of all political parties in this country upon the problem of government in India. India is likely to become a political issue of the first importance for the remainder of the year. Before the limelight is turned on, and while it is still possible to discuss the issues detached from the specific recommendations which it will be the duty of Sir John Simon and his colleagues to make, it may be convenient to take stock of the situation and to examine the scene upon which the spotlight will so soon be cast.

There has been a perceptible hardening of opinion on the constitutional question, both in England and in India, during the last few months—protest against undue concessions in England, protest against inadequate concessions or undue delay in India. This is perhaps an inevitable preliminary to the struggle which will shortly commence. The matter is being treated as a bargaining transaction. Both sides are nervous lest their representatives may give away too much, and in true Eastern fashion are putting their terms as high as possible.

The circumstances which have led to a discussion of the Indian problem in anticipation of the Simon Commission's Report deserve a careful examination. In the summer of last year the Viceroy came home on leave. Though his decision to come home was taken before the General Election, and his object was principally to obtain a much-needed rest, yet the change of Government in England made the visit particularly opportune, and during his stay in England Lord Irwin was able to hold some valuable conferences with the new Secretary of State. In the first two and a half years of his term of office, Lord Irwin had experienced, as others have done before him, the great difficulty of convincing Indians of the sincerity of British professions of sympathy with their national aspirations. Being himself a man of transparent sincerity, he was grieved to find himself involved in a fog of suspicion and mistrust, which he was quite unable to dissipate. It was not merely a question of failing to satisfy a few

extremists as to the value of the constitutional changes made in 1919, or as to the rate of progress towards the admitted goal. Even men of sober judgment and reasonable expectations professed serious misgivings as to the definition of the goal itself, and as to the sincerity of British intentions to assist its early attainment. At the same time equally serious misgivings were expressed by Indian princes as to the effect upon their States of the reforms already carried out in the administration of British India, and of the extravagant demands of extremist politicians.

This atmosphere of suspicion and uneasiness was largely due to the vagueness of the phrases used from time to time by responsible authorities when referring to the goal of British policy in India, and was increased by the circumstances in which the Simon Commission was appointed. The misgivings of the princes were due to the fact that they could get little information about the position they were to occupy in the future Constitution of India. Lord Irwin's principal object, therefore, in the discussions he held with His Majesty's Government was to secure their approval of a final attempt on his part to dissipate, if possible, this atmosphere of mistrust before the Report of the Commission was published. The policy by which he sought to attain this object had two features. The first was a declaration, with the approval of His Majesty's Government, that the ultimate attainment by India of the status of a Dominion was implicit in the declaration of 1917 and the preamble of the Act of 1919, and the second was an announcement that the publication of the Simon Commission's Report would be followed by a Conference, in which three parties would be represented—the British Government, the Indian princes, and British India—to discuss freely and fully the whole situation and the constitutional changes which it would then be possible to undertake. In due course this policy was approved, and carried out in the publication of the correspondence between Sir John Simon and the Prime Minister and in the statement issued by the Viceroy from Delhi immediately after his return to India. Evidence of the wisdom of the Viceroy's policy is to be found in the unanimity of approval which it secured in India from all sections of opinion, both British and Indian. The more important of the two features of this policy—namely, the announcement of the tripartite Conference—was equally favourably received in England, but the reference to Dominion status—due to a misunderstanding, which it is difficult to believe was not a deliberate misrepresentation—aroused a storm of protest in the Press and acrimonious debates in both Houses of Parliament. This misunderstanding was caused by rumours, widely circulated before the statement appeared, that the Government had decided to

promise immediate Dominion status to India in advance of the publication of the Simon Commission's Report. The result was that one sentence in the Viceroy's statement, which was almost unnoticed in India, was singled out in England as evidence of the wicked intention of the Government to forestall the recommendations of the Commission.

If any justification were needed for the statement which has been so much criticised, it may be found in the debates which took place in Parliament last November. In the House of Lords three ex-Secretaries of State took part in the debate, and a perusal of their speeches will show what good ground Indians have had for their anxieties about the ultimate goal of British policy and the rate of progress which they might expect towards the realisation of their own ambitions. Lord Birkenhead declared that it was 'crude ignorance' to give India 'an indication never made before, not sanctioned by the Simon Commission, that it is your goal that she shall attain Dominion status,' and he added that no sane man expected to see such a condition realised within a hundred years. Lord Peel, another Conservative ex-Secretary of State, also considered it unwise to define as Dominion status the ultimate goal of British policy in India, because, 'considering the differences between the political problems you meet there and in the Dominions, considering also the historical past on which institutions rest in India, as compared with those in other Dominions, it might quite well follow that precisely the same political development is not the best for India.' But the most remarkable sentence of all was used by Lord Crewe, a Liberal ex-Secretary of State, who, after associating himself with the protests made by others against the use of the phrase 'Dominion status,' went on to define what he himself understood to be the ultimate goal of British policy. 'I should have preferred,' he said, 'to put it in this way, that the goal we have in view as the ultimate state of things in India is one by which all Indian affairs should, so far as is compatible with the continuance of British India as part of the British Empire, be managed by Indians in India with the very minimum of interference by Parliament here.' If that, then, is all that is understood by these responsible authorities as the ultimate goal of British policy in India, as the fulfilment of the declaration of 1917 and the preamble of the Act of 1919, 'in the fulness of time,' 'with evolutionary development,' that a state of affairs would be reached in some dim and distant future, when 'Indian affairs will be managed with the minimum of interference by Parliament here,' is it surprising that Indians, not merely extremist, but moderate and sensible Indians, should feel some misgivings about the value of the future for which they are invited to wait indefinitely?

Here let me point out that the words which have excited so much controversy are 'Dominion status,' not 'Dominion constitution' or 'Dominion government'—a fact which both Lord Birkenhead and Lord Peel overlooked. No one can say as yet precisely what form the Indian Constitution will ultimately assume, to which of the existing Dominion constitutions it will most nearly approximate, whether it may not, in fact, differ fundamentally from them all, yet can anyone doubt for a moment that when India finally attains 'the full responsible self-government,' 'the equal partnership within the Empire,' 'Swaraj within the Empire,' or 'the liberty enjoyed by the other Dominions,' to mention a few of the phrases that have been authoritatively used in the past, her status will be the same as that of the other self-governing Dominions? Does anyone conceive of 'equal partnership' or 'full responsible self-government' without Dominion status? If Lord Irwin was justified in thinking that 'it is implicit in the Declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress as there contemplated is the attainment of Dominion status'—if, moreover, he knew that some Indians felt a doubt as to whether this was so—it was natural that he should wish to make the matter clear once and for all. That he had justly estimated the requirements of the situation in India is shown by the approval which his statement met with from every section of opinion in India. That he did not equally well estimate the effect his statement would have upon opinion in this country was not surprising, as it is almost impossible for anyone to keep equally well in touch with opinion in England and in India. If he had realised how easily his statement could be misrepresented, and how little support he would receive from those whom he had a right to regard as his friends, he would have been wiser to have omitted the passage about Dominion status from the statement dealing with the proposed Conference, which was an announcement of a new policy, and to have made this declaration on another occasion, in reply to some invitation (which is never lacking in India) to reconcile the goal of British policy with Indian aspirations. It would have been worth avoiding the recent parliamentary debates, which have done nothing but harm and have to a large extent destroyed the value of the Viceroy's action in India.

Both the criticism and the defence of the Government have been unfortunate. The criticism that the recognition of Dominion status as an ultimate goal was equivalent to a promise of its realisation in the immediate future played directly into the hands of the agitators and mischief-makers in India; Mr. Benn's reluctance to admit that his policy did not differ from that of his predecessor in office seemed to justify the suspicions of his English

cation, and finally the definite assurances of the Prime Minister and the Viceroy that there has been no change of policy has discouraged their friends in India. Quite obviously the more precise definition of the ultimate goal could not alter or diminish in the slightest degree the limitations as to time and method contained in the preamble of the Act of 1919. Equally obviously the willingness to be precise and frank about the nature of the goal represented a change, if not of policy, at least of mentality, from that of the men who had refused such frankness and precision.

The suggestion that the Viceroy's statement could either in intention or effect be embarrassing to Sir John Simon and his colleagues does not really bear examination. The statement had no bearing on the subject-matter of Sir John Simon's inquiry. It defined somewhat more explicitly than has hitherto been done the goal of that policy which had been foreshadowed in 1917 and embodied in the Act of 1919. The Simon Commission is not required to state what that policy was: it is asked to express its opinion as to whether, in the light of ten years' experience, that policy was wise or unwise—if unwise, how it should be altered; if wise, how it should be developed. If any ambiguity existed as to the precise aim and tendency of such policy, and if such ambiguity has been removed by the Viceroy's statement, it will render the task of the Commission easier, not harder. If, moreover, the statement of the Viceroy succeeded in dispelling mistrust and restoring confidence in India (and that was avowedly his object in making it), then the Report of the Commission would be assured of a better atmosphere at the time of its reception. In either case the object of the statement was to help, not to embarrass, the Commission, and those who say that it should not have been made till after the publication of the Commission's Report fail altogether to understand Lord Irwin's object in making it.

The only redeeming feature in the two debates, which were otherwise mainly harmful, was the speech made by Mr. Baldwin. The value of this great speech almost outweighed the mischief of all the others, and showed that the leader of the Conservative Party realised what the leader of the Liberal Party did not, that, though he was speaking in the House of Commons, his words would be reported in India, where they would have a greater and more lasting effect than that which they produced in this country.

Such being the effect of recent events in this country, let us now see what their reaction in India has been.

To understand the action of different groups in India it is necessary to remember certain features which are at all times characteristic of the Indian problem. In the first place, it is important to bear in mind that the aspiration to see established

an Indian State, politically free, governed from within itself, independent of outside control, controlling its own administrative machine, responsible for its own defence, and able to speak for itself among the other States of the world, is not merely the claim of a small group of Congress extremists, but is common to all sections of Indian opinion—Swarajists, Liberals, Hindus and Moslems alike. Even the lower castes who have gained most from British protection, and have most to fear from the withdrawal of that protection, share that dream. To them it may not seem immediately realisable, but the educated members of these lower castes have conceived of a State governed as this country is governed, and share the delusion that such a State can be created by a legislative enactment with special clauses for their protection. Even Indian princes who are most critical of democratic forms of government have had visions of a free and independent Indian State, in which their authority would not be diminished, but increased. This spirit of nationalism, which means different things to different people, is common to all, and is the result of the political unity which India has acquired under British rule. The ideal, therefore, which has been proclaimed by the Indian National Congress for about fifty years, however unrepresentative that body may be shown to be, has evoked a certain measure of sympathy in the minds of all educated Indians, even when their proposals or their methods have been condemned.

Some people believe—and Indian Swarajists are not alone in this—that to want a political condition constitutes a right to it, and that the assertion of a right establishes the possibility of its attainment. Many Indians are wise enough to recognise the difficulties that beset the realisation of their dream, but are nevertheless sanguine enough to believe it realisable. The basis of this common ideal is not a desire for a better government, or the belief that the government of an independent State would be more efficient—indeed, the functions of government receive little attention from any section of Indian opinion—but the belief that the form of its government constitutes the hall-mark of a nation's freedom. Criticism, therefore, of the lowering of the standard of efficiency or integrity, which it is feared would result from the changes proposed, or which it is believed has resulted from the changes which have taken place—and such criticisms are natural enough from experienced officials—have little weight in India, because they have no relevance to the basis of the Indian nationalist ideal. Archbishop Magee once said that he would rather see England free than compulsorily sober. So most Indians feel to-day, that they would rather see India free than India compulsorily well governed.

The result is that though there is almost unanimity of opinion in India, with regard to the Nationalist ideal, agreement goes

no further. Local interests, racial interests, communal interests, caste interests, are immediately found in conflict the moment any attempt is made to translate this ideal into political machinery. The form of government with which the national ideal has come to be associated in recent years as the result of British influence in the country and the education of Indians in this country—namely, parliamentary government on a representative basis—is a particularly difficult one to adapt to Indian conditions. A representative system involves the selection of a few individuals by larger bodies to represent them and transact business on their behalf. But such a system implies the confidence of the larger body in the individuals so selected, and the willingness of the selected few to exercise responsibility and act according to their own judgment in the interests of those by whom they have been selected.

These necessary conditions are rarely satisfied in India. We are constantly reminded that India is a mere *colluvies gentium*—a collection of different races, speaking many different languages with different religions, communities and castes. But this has not prevented the welding of those diverse elements into a single political State, and it need not prevent such a State acquiring in time the characteristics of a nation. To accomplish this, however, a spirit of conciliation is required and a readiness to co-operate for a common good. This spirit is at present conspicuous by its absence in India. Co-operation is what the Indian finds it hardest to concede. Therefore, he has made a political virtue out of a temperamental necessity, and non-co-operation is now proclaimed as the test of true patriotism. The Swarajist politician professes that it is only with a 'satanic' Government that he will not co-operate. In practice it is not so. He finds it just as difficult to co-operate with his own countrymen. Every Indian claims to speak in the name of India, but there are few subjects on which other Indians will accept his authority. Not even for the sake of India will the Hindu make any concession to the Moslem or the Moslem to the Hindu, the Brahmin to the non-Brahmin or the man of caste to the outcaste. The Sikh is disowned by the Mahratta, the Madrassi by the Jhat; the man of the hills has nothing in common with those of the plains, and the Bengali will not co-operate even with himself. This lack of confidence makes all representative machinery unworkable. Conferences are summoned of representatives of Hindus and Moslems to compose some difference between their two communities; but the representatives of each side consider themselves bound by some resolution or programme of their constituent bodies, refuse to budge an inch, and the conference fails. Ministers are selected from the majority in a Legislative Council, and find after their

appointment that their followers expect to give instructions, not to receive them. The representative in India is, in fact, never more than a delegate.

If India were prepared to accept the good offices of a mediator between her conflicting interests, Mr. Gandhi could have rendered immense services to his country in that capacity. As a social reformer he is a genuine idealist. As a politician he is impotent, being easily duped by astute party managers. His dislike of violence is sincere, but he is readily persuaded that conciliation or compromise will drive the uncompromising elements into violent action as a counsel of despair, and that the best way to prevent violence is for him to champion the most extreme demands.

If these general features of the situation are remembered, there has been nothing surprising or disturbing in recent events in India. All the characteristics I have mentioned have been exhibited, as was to be expected. The Viceroy's statement was at once recognised and welcomed, as both a satisfactory recognition of the Indian national ideal and as a practical contribution towards its attainment. The free and open round-table conference has always found favour in India. It has often been asked for since 1919. It has never yet been offered. In so far as the policy of the declaration affected the ideal, therefore, it was eminently satisfactory to everyone. The moment its practical application was considered the inevitable difficulties of the Indian problem asserted themselves. The Congress Party discovered in the offer of a Conference an invitation to co-operate, and co-operation is not permitted to them unless it is purchased by the Government at the price of some humiliating concession. 'Had the Government, in fact, conceded anything ?' they asked themselves. The matter must be put to the test. So they immediately formulated conditions which they knew would be unacceptable and invited the Government to accept them. The Conference was not to be called to hear and discuss the practicability of alternative proposals, but to draft a Dominion constitution, and to ensure a draft which would be acceptable to themselves the Congress was to be assured of a majority of its members—a claim truly characteristic of the Congress politician! In order to fortify themselves with a rejection of their demands, Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru asked for an interview with the Viceroy immediately before the meeting of the Congress at Lahore. To grant the interview in the circumstances was clearly a mistake in tactics, but Lord Irwin, as they knew, does not give much consideration to questions of tactics. The interview was granted on December 23, with the inevitable result. The way was now clear. The Congress met unembarrassed by a Government concession and heartened by a fresh rebuff. The usual

violent speeches were indulged in, and the ultimate goal was once more satisfactorily pushed beyond the range of any possible concession. An ultimate Dominion status having been admitted, the claim to complete independence was established in its place. Civil disobedience was once more threatened, with the cautious proviso that the time and the place for its inauguration were to be left for future consideration. Quotations from the speeches and the text of the resolutions were duly telegraphed to this country, and provided those sections of our Press which are opposed to any further concessions to the claims of Indian nationalism with a justification for counter-threats and recrimination. Thus the Indian extremists, true to their traditions, at a moment which seemed to their friends in this country propitious for the championship of their cause, took the course best calculated to frighten back into hostility opinion that only wants a little encouragement to be friendly. Indian politicians are accustomed in their speeches and writings to represent political crime and hostility as the consequence of repression. Historically the exact opposite is the case. In recent years crime and violence have always followed concessions, and repression has, of course, followed crime.

So much for the Lahore Congress. Nothing happened there which anyone with knowledge of Indian conditions could not have foretold. The Congress Party in India does not wish to help; its one object is to obstruct, and even in this object it cannot remain united. Because of personal differences, Messrs. Sabash Bose, Srinvivasa Iyengar, and Satyamurti felt compelled to break away and form a new Congress Democratic Party, thus assuring internal dissensions and criticisms within the Congress itself. The obstructive tactics of the Swarajist members in the Indian Legialatures have hitherto been embarrassing. This is now to cease, and the futile policy of the boycott, which embarrasses no one, has been renewed. Even in this there is no unanimity. The whole of the Hindu Mahasabha group have decided to remain, but the solid block of Swarajist opposition is now reduced to an impotent handful. The strength of the independence movement was put to the test all over India on January 26, and proved a complete frost. The response of the country to the new appeal was shown to be negligible.

Let us now turn to the activities of other parties. The proposed Conference has been accepted by the Indians of the Liberal Party and also by the Mohammedans, and their various organisations are making vigorous preparations for the presentation of their case. These parties at least differ from the Congress Party in that they are genuinely anxious to help; but here also the usual characteristics are being shown. Nowhere is there any

evidence of the selection of trusted representatives to whom authority would be given to attend the Conference and confer freely with the other parties. On the contrary, the various organisations are busy holding meetings and passing resolutions intended to fetter as closely as possible the discretion of their delegates. What hope of success would any Conference have which met in such conditions? Nothing is more needed at the present time than a real round-table conference of the leading representatives of all sections of Indian opinion, whose interests would be affected by the proposals of the Simon Commission or by any changes in the Constitution which might result therefrom. But for the success of such a conference it would be necessary for the representatives attending it to face facts instead of trying to argue them away, to make a serious effort to reconcile differences by making concessions instead of asserting claims of which no modification is permitted, to exercise their individual judgment, wisdom and responsibility, instead of merely voicing the formulas of a mandate from which they have no authority to depart. There is still time for preparations to be made for a conference on these lines, but the omens at the moment are not very hopeful.

The scene is now set, the actors are arrayed in their stage costumes, and all are waiting for Sir John Simon to ring up the curtain on the next act. How far in that act the drama will progress towards its *dénouement* depends on others than Sir John Simon and his colleagues. Indian politicians are fond of asking the Government for a change of heart. The use of the phrase is comforting to them, for it suggests that the Government alone is responsible for any delay in their progress, but we are daily reminded that there are many hearts in which a change would be beneficial. British statesmen would find it easier to help India if her public men were less insistent on the fact that the interests of the two countries were necessarily antagonistic. The urgent need of the moment is to find the lines along which the interests of both countries can equally be served. That will be the main purpose of the Conference which is to meet this year. The British Government, the Indian princes and British India all have different interests, and if their differences alone are insisted upon there can be little progress. But they also have much in common, and it will be the duty of each to pursue courageously and exclusively their common gain. The realisation of India's nationa ideal would also be the triumph of British statesmanship, but i the practical difficulties, which are enormous, are to be overcome, Indians will have to show greater confidence in each other and realise that a nation cannot be created out of criticism alone. British statemen, too, must remember that responsibility has to be imposed before it can be exercised. Advisory functions and

supervised authority are no training in the exercise of responsibility, and it is in such a school that India has hitherto been expected to graduate.

The task which we have set ourselves to accomplish in India is one which has never yet been accomplished in the history of the world. To ignore the difficulties, to be blind to facts, is to court failure. To exaggerate the difficulties, to be lacking in faith, is to court despair. Let the facts and the difficulties be boldly faced, but let faith and experience lead us to overcome them. Religious divisions we have known ourselves; they have produced strife, but they have forced toleration. Invasions and conquests we have experienced from without, but our Constitution we have evolved from within. We cannot impose upon India a written Constitution that will suit the conditions of a country of which but few of us know anything. We can but help to produce the machinery that will enable Indians to mould their own Government to satisfy the conditions of their country.

The present Government has taken the wisest course open to them. 'We shall shortly have before us,' they have said, 'the recommendations of a Commission that has devoted two years to its task. Before we commit ourselves to any decision upon its Report, we invite representatives of the Indian princes and of various communities in British India to confer with us freely and openly upon the whole problem.' No fairer offer could be made. The world is watching with interest the response which India will make, the use she will make of so great an opportunity. Those who have replied, 'We will not confer with you, we will neither contribute any suggestions ourselves nor listen to anyone else,' have already shown themselves to be a negligible element in the solution of the problem. Again, if any representatives attend the Conference and say 'We will state the case of those whom we represent, but we will listen to no other,' they will make but a poor contribution to the discussion. But if India sends her best men, and they apply their best judgment to a consideration of the practical difficulties and the reconciliation of the conflicting interests involved in the problem, the present year may prove to be the beginning of a new and brighter chapter in the history of their country.

LYTTON.

THE COAL MINES BILL

At the time of writing this article the Coal Mines Bill, introduced by the Government, has passed the second reading, and is before the House of Commons in committee stage. Consideration of Part I. of the Bill, which relates to the marketing of coal, has been deferred until the other parts have been dealt with. Many amendments to the Bill have been set down and will be proposed and debated, some of which, if passed, will considerably alter its complexion. Indeed, it may emerge from Parliament an Act bearing but small resemblance to the Bill as introduced. The Bill is divided into five parts, namely :

Part I., relating to the production, supply and sale of coal ;

Part II., dealing with hours of work ;

Part III., referring to the setting up of a Coal Mines National Industrial Board ;

Part IV. deals with the subject of amalgamations, provides for three Commissioners, since amended to five. This was not contemplated in the first draft of the Bill ; and

Part V., which contains certain general provisions, including an interpretation clause.

It is with the provisions of Part I. that the present writer is chiefly concerned. Part I. of the Bill really embodies the conclusions arrived at by the majority of the colliery owners in certain districts, the genesis of which was the original 'Five Counties' scheme, as the working arrangement operative in the Midland Area was termed. To the Five Counties scheme, as well as to the scheme as extended, there has been all along strong opposition by a minority of the coal owners and miners' leaders. In adopting the majority view, with other matters added thereto in which the colliery owners were not in agreement, there can be no doubt the Government was animated by the high motive of bringing peace and prosperity to the industry. The present writer, when the Five Counties scheme was mooted, was at first inclined to regard as both practicable and desirable the principle of giving to each constituent member, whether district or national, a tonnage quota, believing that in the long

run the quota of each coal district would be decided by low production costs and that the colliery which was able to produce below the cost upon which controlled quotations were based would maintain, and probably increase, its quota and make a better profit. But a fuller investigation of the facts, and more mature consideration of the subject, disclosed the untenability of the proposition.

The Bill sets out that each coal-mining district is to have a scheme, to be worked by the colliery owners themselves, with a central co-ordinating scheme for the whole of Great Britain, which schemes, when approved by the Board of Trade, shall have statutory effect. The production from each coal-mining district and each colliery in a district is to be limited, a maximum output being fixed. In the words of the explanatory memorandum to the Bill, the schemes are to be so framed 'as to ensure that, within reasonable limits, the quantity of coal offered for sale by a colliery and the price charged for it shall accord with the state of current demand'—a somewhat indeterminate statement; for who is to decide what are 'reasonable limits' and what are the factors for the ascertainment of the 'state of current demand'?

Sub-section 6 of section 1 (Part I.) reads: 'any scheme for the time being in force shall have effect as if it were enacted in this Act,' which is to say that the Five Counties scheme, being now in force, would have statutory sanction on the passage of the Bill, and would be compulsorily applied to the present non-members. Will, one is led to ask, those firms who are brought into the scheme in this way receive less favourable treatment than those which have joined voluntarily?

The Bill contains no definition of 'standard output' or 'standard tonnage,' which are vital factors in the case, seeing that the 'quotas' subsequently to be fixed are merely a ratio or percentage of the 'standard tonnage.' Clause 6 (*c*) makes it clear that the 'standard tonnage' is to be determined by the provisions of the district scheme, so that the 'standard tonnage' *has been fixed* in respect of those coalfields where the Five Counties scheme is operative, but fixed in an unreal, artificial, and unfair manner. To prove this, let us see what the procedure is. It is, in the first instance, to allow members to take for their 'datum' or 'standard' the best single year between 1912–1927 for each pit. Thus, one firm took 1913 for pit A, 1925 for pit B, and 1927 for pit C, or the best year in that period for each pit, the aggregate output so arrived at being far in excess of any average year. The first quota was 67 per cent. of the standard thus determined. The anomaly is made clearer when it is stated that, in the case in point, 67 per cent. actually represented 105 per cent. of the real average output of the undertaking. Apply the method

with the Act in force. Yorkshire would be allowed x of the 'standard tonnage' for the county. The present members would retain their quotas (since there is no obligation to review), and members brought in by the Bill be given an unfair quota.

We are informed that the public interest is protected by the fact that all details of every scheme must be approved by the Board of Trade, and, further, by the provision made in the Bill for the formation of a National Committee and district committees of investigation, including representatives of consumers. The erection of such committees was not contemplated, and is being vigorously opposed by the colliery owners as an unjustifiable interference in their industry. The answer to this opposition is, of course, that the coal-mining industry differs to a large extent from other industries in that it is basic in character, as it is concerned with the production of a material upon the existence of which other forms of industrial productive effort are fundamentally dependent. How far the public is protected under the provisions referred to will be seen from an examination of the personnel of the committees. The National Committee is to comprise nine members and the district committees five members each. In the case of the National Committee two of the members are to be representative of the owners and two of the miners. In that of the district committees there is to be one of each. The other halves are to be representative of the consumers' interests, the chairman being the odd man. The Board of Trade appoints the committees. The representatives of the colliery owners and miners will probably unite to maintain a high price level. Much will depend upon the view taken by the chairmen (the interests, if any, of which they are representative are not stated) ; clearly they should be impartially minded persons and hold the balance between the equally divided high and low price elements in the committees.

If the complaints reported by the committee to the Board of Trade concerning the operation of a scheme in any district are not rectified, the Board may direct that the scheme shall cease to have statutory effect. The Central Investigating Committee is to investigate matters concerned with the central scheme and the district investigating committees matters relating to the district schemes.

In this connection, an outstanding anomaly of the Bill may be pointed out. Whereas under the Bill a majority of the owners may impose the provisions of a scheme upon their unwilling neighbours, on the other hand, if a majority of the owners (as for example in Scotland) refuse to work a scheme imposed by the Board of Trade, the Government has no power to enforce such scheme on the owners.

The machinery is very cumbersome. The investigation committees, apparently, do not get to work until a complaint is lodged. They do not act of their own volition. Their position is not enviable, for presumably frivolous complaints and complaints from disgruntled persons will have to receive attention as well as valid complaints. The period that must elapse before a *bonâ fide* complaint is fully met will be extensive, the order being as follows: first, complaint; second, complaint investigated by the committee; third, report of the committee to the Board of Trade; fourth, consideration of the report by the Board of Trade, 'and if, after considering the report and consulting such persons as appear to them to be affected, the Board agree with the opinion of the committee, the Board shall make recommendations to the council or executive board charged with the duty of administering the scheme with a view to the rectification of the matter complained of.' But this is not all, for the Board of Trade may hold inquiries for the purpose of assisting them to consider the report of a committee of investigation—a long-drawn-out business. The fact of the matter is that if once fixation of prices, with its necessary corollary, the artificial quota in production, is instituted, flexibility, so important in an industry like the coal trade, if not destroyed, is seriously impaired by the machinery necessary to prevent the abuse of the system and to protect the public.

The promotion of Part I. of the Bill is evidently due to the supposition that the demand for British coal is considerably less than the productive capacity of the collieries. In this connexion reference may be made to Professor Jones' interesting article in the issue of *The Nineteenth Century* of last month, where he states that the productive capacity of British collieries has increased since 1913 from approximately 290,000,000 tons (the actual output for that year was 287,000,000 tons) to approximately 330,000,000 tons per annum at the present time, 'while,' says he, 'the demand for British coal has fallen from 290,000,000 tons to approximately 250,000,000 tons,' adding, 'Such is the problem to be solved.'

But are these statements based on sound reasoning? All that can be stated positively is that 287,000,000 tons were raised and sold in the year 1913 and about 256,000,000 tons (not 250,000,000 tons) were raised and sold during 1929. The probability is that more than 287,000,000 tons could have been raised in 1913. Owing to the concentration upon and the intensive working of the most available coal during the war, the limitation imposed on the supply of plant and machinery, and the consequently restricted development, the productive capacity of the collieries after the war was for some years certainly much

below that of 1913. The probability is that at the present time it is about equal to that of 1913.

The school favouring price fixation and restriction proceeds, then, on the assumption that the productive capacity of the mines is greatly in excess of the demand, hence competition by the collieries for the largest share possible compatible with their production capacity must bring down the price realisable to, and indeed below, the line of the cost of production. Consequently it is argued, the only way to meet the situation is to diminish production, bringing it to the level of demand, to establish minimum selling prices, and to parcel out the production to meet the demand, district by district, and colliery by colliery, enabling all to get a profit. This is really the old attitude of the miners, who used to advocate restriction of output in order to force up wages, an attitude which was condemned by the colliery owners, but is now to be applied by them to their own case. If this is not the process of reasoning followed, it is not possible to understand the *raison d'être* of the Bill. That this ratiocination is based upon an imperfect knowledge of the industry and of economics is not difficult to establish: those who pursue it are putting the cart before the horse. They are attacking the problem from the wrong end.

To advance in support of the Government and other similar marketing schemes, as some persons do, the case of the Westphalian Syndicate is beside the point. The cases are not fairly comparable. The Westphalian Syndicate covers but one field; the other German fields, with one exception, produce quite a different kind of fuel—namely, brown coal, of a vastly lower calorific value than true coal. The two classes of fuel do not enter into competition with one another. The brown coal is not exported, being mostly consumed near the point of production. The brown coalfields are far distant from the Westphalian field, and into their area but little true coal is carried. The other true coalfield, Silesia, is distant from the Westphalian field over 500 miles as the crow flies, whereas in Great Britain we have numerous coalfields separated from each other by comparatively short distances. Professor Jones states, in his article already referred to, that the syndicate during the British coal stoppage in 1926 did not charge exorbitant prices. That is so; but it did what was as bad for us—it insisted on long-term contracts, greatly to the detriment of the British coal trade. Some of these contracts have only recently terminated.

Whilst on the subject of Germany, attention may be called to the fact that that country is, as was predicted, making reprisals in regard to the Five Counties Scheme in that steps are being taken to prevent the unregulated importation of subsidised

(through an inland levy) British coal. At this very moment the Five Counties plan is crumbling. Exports from Hull and Humber ports have rapidly diminished during the last few months.

On reflecting over the subject before us one arrives at five definite conclusions which are both axiomatic and fundamental. These are:

(1) That the price of fuel is one of the principal items in the cost of living. In this respect fuel is only second in importance to air, water, and food;

(2) That the world demand for coal is constantly on the up grade;

(3) That the extent of the demand for coal is in very large measure governed by the price at which it is available;

(4) That the limitation of output—*i.e.*, the introduction of the artificial quota—leads to the enhancement of the cost of production; and

(5) That the fixing of selling prices is an instrument making for decreased demand.

The examination of the costing accounts of almost any manufacturing concern will make evident the very important part which power, heat, and light—in other words, fuel—plays in the cost of production. In many cases this item is second only in importance to that of labour. The increase of only a few pence per ton in the price of fuel has a marked effect in the cost of many commodities—*e.g.*, gas, electricity, steel, metals generally, and chemicals. The price of nearly every sort of raw or manufactured thing is, though gradually falling, higher now than in pre-war days. The downward grade towards the establishment of a general economic level will be assisted materially by a reduction in the price of fuel. But the effect of Part I. of the Bill would be to make one of the links in the vicious circle stronger. If we take the latest figures available—namely, those for the quarter ending June 30, 1929—and compare them with those for the 'boom' year 1913, we will find that the selling price is now 60 per cent. and the cost of production 115 per cent. higher than in 1913. But if the comparison is instituted between present-day figures and those in respect of a normal pre-war year the difference is still more marked.

The visualisation of the situation as of a fixed world demand for coal and all coal-producing countries as struggling for the biggest possible share of it is an erroneous point of view. The world's production—and presumably, therefore, the measure of its consumption (seeing that coal only within very small limits is a storable article)—is on the up grade. Let us take four years—namely, 1900, because it was a purely normal year; 1913, because it was a 'boom' year in the British coal trade (a decline

set in early in 1914), when the record output of 287,000,000 tons was attained, and because it was the last complete year before the war (the war period 1914–1918 inclusive, it will be agreed, should be omitted as being entirely abnormal, as also the years immediately succeeding the war, as being a period of feverish activity, to be followed by one of intense depression), and the year 1928, though a year of depression, as it witnessed the beginning of improvement in the coal trade in Britain and elsewhere; and, finally, as indicative of the most recent trend in production of coal, the figures for the last year, as based on the first six months, are given. The figures in long tons are:

For 1900	765,000,000
,, 1913	1,324,000,000
,, 1928	1,430,000,000
,, 1929	1,490,000,000

It will be seen that the world demand for coal during the year 1928 was 106,000,000 tons in excess of the 'boom' year 1913, when Great Britain produced her maximum output, and that for 1929 60,000,000 tons in excess of 1928. The upward grade in coal consumption, it should be remarked, continues in spite of the increased consumption of such substitutes for coal as oil and hydro-electric power—substitutes the advent of which is largely, indeed mainly, due to the high price of coal—and in spite, also, of the more scientific and economic use of coal. That the more economic use of coal cannot be relied upon as a check to consumption—indeed, the effect is quite the reverse, seeing that economy in use conduces to cheapness in generation of power, and the cheaper anything is the more of it there is consumed—was shown to be true by Jevons in his well-known work on the Coal Question. Coal is too dear in Great Britain. If the price is lowered the consumption will increase. The up grade in world consumption since the war has proceeded at a slower rate than before it. The reason for this is obvious; the post-war price of coal, as in the case of nearly all commodities, is considerably greater. The problem for solution is not how to meet a reduced demand by fixing higher selling prices and restricting output—as intended under Part I. of the Coal Mines Bill—but how to decrease the cost of production so as to enable us to sell at a lower price, if need be, and so to increase the demand for our coal. In the words of an eminent Scottish colliery owner, Mr. Wallace Thorneycroft, in one of a series of articles published by the *Glasgow Herald* on January 8, 1930, 'We must reduce our costs in order to get someone to buy what we can make at prices that yield some profit to the heavy industries. The standard of living ultimately depends upon production per head of population, but that pro-

duction must be at a price that enables us to command our share of the world's markets.' Mr. Thorneycroft is, of course, quite right. The standard of living does ultimately depend upon production per head of population, and upon the power consumption per head of population, in which respect it is interesting to institute a comparison between Great Britain and the United States of America. In the latter country the amount of power used per worker is 56 per cent. more than in the United Kingdom; and if we eliminate workers in trades where the use of power is limited, or even impossible, we shall find that in the United States the use of power where it *can* be used is nearly double what it is here. In the United States not only is the standard of wages higher than in the United Kingdom, but living conditions are better. Incidentally, the best cure for low wages is more motive power. Or, from the manufacturer's or colliery owner's point of view, the chief offset against the increasing cost of labour is the more extensive use of motive power. Hence the importance of procuring cheap power produced with the greatest economy of fuel.

What is not generally recognised by the lay public is that deductions made from the comparison of a coal mine with a factory, from the point of view of production, are entirely unreliable, inasmuch as the comparison is not one of like with like. Whereas in the case of a factory it is possible to diminish the output of the manufactured articles with but slight, if any, increase of cost per ton by merely cutting out a section of the works, it is not possible to do so in a coal mine. In the latter instance whatever the output—within, of course, certain wide limits—the same length of main roadways has to be maintained, the full ventilation has to be produced, the same amount of water has to be raised, nearly the same number of boilers have to be kept up, and the dead rents have to be paid. Many, one might say most, collieries can only be worked at a profit on the basis of a full output. Continuity of operation is essential if cost per ton is to be kept down. The allocation to many collieries of an artificial quota well below the capacity of production would spell ruin unless the price realisable per ton produced was considerably advanced, hence the reason for fixing selling prices and for the cutting out of competition. But inasmuch as higher selling prices must conduce to a decrease in demand, with consequently a smaller quota, the price will have to be still further advanced, and so on and so on—a sort of 'rake's progress.' Under the scheme, if the export trade in coal is to be maintained in the face of foreign competition, it must be at the expense of the home consumer, which is tantamount to saying that the export must be preserved by means of taxation of the British public for the benefit of the foreign con-

sumers, who will be given the advantage of cheap coal in competition with the British manufacturer. As Mr. A. Allan Paton said in his admirable and lucid address at the annual meeting of Martins Bank at Liverpool on January 28 last, this would 'inevitably lead to the dumping of more foreign material into this country, thus reducing the home production of iron and steel and thereby increasing unemployment.'

Having shown the inadequacy of Part I. of the Bill to meet the situation—especially in view of the fact that, under Part II., it is proposed to reduce the working time of the miners by half an hour—it is incumbent on the critic to point out the real cure—if he has one—for the ills under which the industry is labouring. In other words, how are costs to be reduced so as to permit of cheaper coal being forthcoming with resultant increased demand? The answer is by organising from the operative source—that is, from the productive end—instead of from the selling end, and instituting more effective cheap and business-like distribution.

As the writer has said elsewhere,[1] 'I, personally, am firmly convinced that the coal mining industry of Great Britain can be placed on a profitable basis, and that in the not distant future; but to accomplish this drastic reorganisation will be required, the first move being in the direction of the combination of the collieries into groups of like natural and trade conditions.' The Samuel Commission, after an examination of the evidence for and against, and by their presentation of the working results of colliery undertakings of different sizes, came to the definite conclusion that amalgamation made for cheaper production. Indeed, when we consider the many and various advantages resulting from the combination upon a proper basis of a number of small production units in a given district, one is surprised that such combinations have not been more widely carried into effect. Where they have been brought about, usually, owing to the desire of overcoming opposition and following the line of least resistance, the capitalisation has been excessive. It is essential, in order that the combinations may be economically effective, that they be on the basis of a present-day valuation and on that of a willing buyer and a willing seller. Inflated capitalisation is subversive to the best interests of the industry, and conducive ultimately to trouble between capital and labour.

If we were to assume that every small railway station on a railway system was left to evolve its own destiny, without control from a central authority at headquarters, we would have

[1] 'The Future of the Coal Mining Industry,' an address delivered at the annual meeting of the British Science Guild, April 1926, and since brought up to date and published in *Progress* of April 1929.

something akin to the system of separate units prevalent in the coal-mining industry. Let us consider in more detail some of the savings which would result from district amalgamation, *i.e.*, from a system of collective production as opposed to the present system of numerous small enterprises.

(1) In the Working of the Collieries. Mechanisation and electrification is very far from complete at our collieries. To take one instance alone. It is reasonable to conclude from the available statistics that of the total horse-power at collieries a considerable proportion remains still unconverted into electricity which might be so converted, probably 1,000,000 horse-power, a figure which would still leave 750,000 horse-power of steam-driven plant at the coal mines. There were in 1924 (the figures are given in respect of 1924 merely because the Census of Production relates to that year) over 337,000 horse-power of reciprocating engines driving electric generators at coal mines. It is probable that a substantial proportion could be replaced by steam turbines, either live steam or mixed pressure, with a reduction of 50 per cent., probably more, of the steam consumption. Fresh capital is needed to enable this to be carried out. Under a system of amalgamation the necessary financial arrangements would be simplified, especially if the Government were to revive, or extend to collieries, the 'trade facilities' principle, making amalgamation on an approved basis a condition precedent to the granting of the financial credit in respect of carrying out an approved scheme of development, mechanisation or reorganisation.

Furthermore, inasmuch as under combinations of collieries the working of coal would be concentrated in the cheaper and more easily worked units, the cost of production would fall not only *to* the present lowest level, but, seeing that the output from these more cheaply worked collieries would be vastly increased, it would tend to fall *below* the present lowest level.

(2) Centralisation of (*a*) Pumping Water and (*b*) Washing and other treatment of Coal for Market would be possible and result in very considerable savings in overhead charges.

(3) The Central Purchasing of Materials for Collieries would make for efficiency and economy. It must be apparent that some 1400 separate concerns (some 2500 collieries) purchasing materials independently cannot do so as effectively or cheaply as if they were a few corporations.

(4) Displacement of Vested Interests. The number of directors would be greatly reduced, as also the number of managing directors, consulting engineers, and general managers. The middlemen—selling agents—would largely disappear and the number of clerks be reduced.

(5) In respect of Privately Owned Railways, Rolling Stock

and Shipping Staithes the reduction would be considerable under a system of common user, with resultant saving in transport costs.

(6) Saving in Freights. There would be control of freights to an extent impossible to a number of small separate units.

(7) Distribution. The principle should be established that coal should be consumed as near the actual point of production as possible, with great resultant saving in transport. This can only be achieved by setting up a system of central control. There are some 700,000 privately owned railway wagons hampering the railway companies by reason of special shunting and marshalling of rolling stock. The system has the effect of increasing colliery costs owing to the amount of shunting they have to do.

In the actual work of marketing coal great savings can be effected. Taking Cardiff, Liverpool, Manchester and London and Southampton, and eliminating *transport* entirely, the cost of distribution was before the war 5*s.* 9½*d.* per ton in the aggregate, since the war 12*s.* per ton. In the Report by the 'Advisory Committee for Coal and the Coal Industry on the possibility of effecting Economies in the Costs that make up the Price of Coal to the consumer,' 1923, it is stated: 'While on the evidence before us we accept the figures, we are bound to remark that those responsible for the distributing trade should take immediate steps to render considerable reductions possible in most of the items.' Nothing has been done. Under such a system as has been adumbrated the work of distribution would be rendered comparatively easy and vastly cheaper.

With the desire of the Government to reduce the hours of work of the coal miners one has every sympathy, but to effect this at the cost of crippling the industry by increasing the cost of production would be a suicidal policy. At the time of writing the reduction from eight to seven and a half hours has been assented to by the House of Commons. It must be remembered that not all collieries are working on an eight-hour basis. One of the results of the reorganisation along the lines indicated in this article would be to render the reduction possible without crippling the industry. The interregnum between the present state of affairs and the coming into full operation of the amalgamations could be met by a loan to the collieries at a small rate of interest and repayable by instalments.

The proposal under Part III. of the Bill to establish an Industrial Board of seventeen members to investigate and report upon disputes as to wages and conditions in the event of failure to settle in the district has been passed in committee, and, let us hope, may prove helpful in bringing peace to the industry. But when it has inquired and reported, will matters be greatly

advanced towards a settlement unless with the combatant the wish for settlement is present?

The British coal-mining industry is the most harassed, unsettled, and legislated for branch of industrial activity in Great Britain. But there are many persons in that industry of conspicuous ability who are 'instinct with self-reliance, and confident, even in adversity, of winning through to success.'[2]

R. A. S. REDMAYNE.

[2] A quotation from a recent leading article in *The Times*.

UNIONIST PARTY POLICY

THE historian who tries in the far-off future to classify and define the outlook of the three parties in the first quarter of the twentieth century will be confronted with some puzzling paradoxes. He will have to explain how Mr. Lloyd George, who has never accepted the Socialist philosophy, led the Liberal Party from the arid sands of *laisser-faire* into the morass of diluted Socialism without his flock noticing any change of pasture; he will have to explain how Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, without ever admitting any flaw in Socialism as a theory, became head of an Administration which treats coal-owners, railway companies, and discount houses with the reverent fear of a worshipper before a shrine. He may study the personnel of the two Administrations of 1929 and spring to the conclusion that the General Election was chiefly significant as showing the country's desire to be ruled by Eton and not by Harrow. But what will be to the historian of the future an academic problem is one of vital importance to the younger school of Unionists who find themselves so much in agreement with many of their opponents, and so much out of sympathy with the older school in their own party, that they often doubt just where they stand and what they stand for.

Temperamentally the Unionist and the Socialist are akin, because they both believe that men are actuated by emotion rather than by reason; but the emotion to which the Unionist appeals is at best patriotism, at worst jingoism, while the Socialist appeals at best to Christian charity, at worst to class hatred. Both are instinctively distrustful, like the elector, of intellectual ability, and like to see power in the hands of country gentlemen or trade union officials. Both parties now sadly recognise that they must hire intellectuals to do their dirty work for them, but they hardly conceal their deep-rooted aversion. That is why the Tories form the 'stupid party' and Labour men 'the silly party.' It is only in the Liberal Party that the Morleys and the Asquiths, the Birrells and the Ramsay Muirs, the Keynes and the Simons, the Samuels and the Fishers can find the rarefied atmosphere in which they float like disembodied intellects. It is no wonder that this thin, small voice of reason fails to make any great appeal to the present electorate.

There is an instinctive antipathy between the Tory and the Radical mind which makes any real union between the two parties unthinkable until the far-off day when the Labour Party will try to bring in Socialism in our time. There is not the same antipathy between Socialists and Tories, but Tories cannot associate themselves in any way with a party which relies so largely upon the support of the feckless, the improvident, the loafer and the half-witted. If it is made a reproach against Conservatives—not without some justification—that they are unduly influenced by the possessing classes, it is an equally justifiable reproach to the Labour Party that they rely upon the support of the lowest section of the community.

Where, then, does the Conservative Party stand? It must discharge the duty to which the Liberal Party has been false of urging economy, the importance of private enterprise, and the freedom of the individual to follow his own will and to retain his own property. It must also discharge the duty to which the Socialists have been false of putting the national interest above vested interests: Breakages, Limited, is already a sinister influence in politics.

It is the chief merit of the Tory Party that it has never allowed itself to become irrevocably committed to any political nostrum; it has never seen the fulfilment of a Divine purpose in unrestricted individualism nor in unqualified Socialism. It is therefore in the happy position of not having to recant, but with enlightened opportunism adapts its policy to circumstances instead of trying to adapt circumstances to *a priori* theory. The strength of the Conservative Party lies in its being always the inevitable alternative Government. Whenever the rash experiments of Liberals or Socialists have alarmed the country and it wants safety first for a little, it always calls the Conservatives back to office. It has been tacitly understood for a century between John Bull and the Tory Party that whenever he wants safety first he will turn to the Unionist Party. The error of making 'safety first' a slogan at the last election was that John Bull felt it to be a breach of confidence for the Unionist Party to publish to the world for the first time a private and a confidential understanding.

The great division of opinion in the Conservative Party which is causing it most uneasiness is the old fiscal problem. Lord Grey said truly that Protectionists always tend to drift into the Conservative Party, and they appear to be preparing a new bid for control. The vital issue is not whether Mr. Baldwin is to remain leader; that is not really in dispute. If he were a less modest man he might quote to the candidates for his office the words of Charles II. to his brother: 'They will never kill me,

James, to make you king!' It is only because two newspaper proprietors happen to dislike him that his personal position has become a subject of discussion in the country. Mr. Baldwin is important chiefly because he determines whether the Protectionist or Free Trade section of the party shall dictate policy.

The Protectionists are right in saying that never before was the country so disposed to try a tariff policy as it is now. So long as Great Britain was prosperous, and every year increasingly so, the arguments in favour of Free Trade were obvious: good health is a strong reason for not going to a quack doctor. But when a man has been long sick, and his family doctor has not been able to cure his complaint, the desire to try any desperate remedy becomes increasingly great. There is always the temptation to discard the qualified practitioner without duly weighing the probability of the quack making matters worse.

Free Trade Unionists recognise with satisfaction that safeguarding has done good to a number of industries, and they do not follow the doctrinaire Liberal assumption that necessarily they must have done harm. They agree that tariffs are a drug and not a food, but strychnine has proved a valuable heart stimulant and saved many lives. Properly and scientifically administered tariffs may do good and no harm, but the cases where they can be beneficially used are few. In particular they will usually raise prices, or (what is equally important) prevent prices from being lowered, and if the article safeguarded is a raw material for anything else the enhancement in price is likely to damage the subsequent industry to at least as great an extent as it benefits the primary one.

So long as safeguarding is restricted to gas mantles, lace, gloves, cutlery, music instruments, etc., there is no reason to suppose that much harm will be done, and the volume of employment in this country may be to a minute extent increased. But is it worthy of a great party to make the safeguarding of gas mantles and music instruments and a heterogeneous collection of other articles reminiscent of a jumble sale catalogue a prominent feature in its programme?

The answer in which everyone concurs is 'No,' and the Protectionists draw the moral that everything ought to be safeguarded—some, indeed, except agriculture, the largest British industry, preferring prudence to logic—and would like to begin with iron and steel. Now here they usually desert the argument that safeguarding does not raise prices to the consumer, and spring nimbly into an adjoining boat with the argument, probably true, that if the British steel industry were guaranteed the home market it could reduce the price of British steel. Without, however, a reduction in the price of foreign steel, the state of such

depressed industries as tin-plating, engineering, and shipbuildin would be made still worse than it is now. As these industrie are even more dependent than the steel industry on expor markets, the drug of safeguarding must here at least lose its potency. Into the old Free Trade *versus* Protection argument it is not the purpose of this article to go, but Conservative Fre Traders summarise their arguments as follows:

(1) They believe Protection to be unsound for any country—

(2) Especially for a country like Great Britain dependent upon and organised for a large export trade;

(3) They note that unemployment is chiefly due to the loss o foreign markets, for which the home market can never b a substitute;

(4) And they do not see why their party should perform th unprecedented feat of committing suicide for a third time in a lifetime to give their Protectionist friends another chance to convert the electorate.

While opposed to a general tariff, we do not deny that safeguarding in special circumstances may prove beneficial, and India would seem to have shown the way. The Indian Fiscal Commission's Report, which was accepted and is acted upon by the Government of India, provides for the creation of a permanent Tariff Board, and all claims for protection put forward by any industry are referred as a matter of course to that board for examination, and its reports are really valuable and impartial documents commanding general confidence. The principles by which it is to be guided are laid down by the Fiscal Commission as follows (par. 97, at p. 54):

> In dealing with all claims to protection the Tariff Board should in the first instance satisfy itself that the following three conditions are fulfilled:
>
> (1) The industry must be one possessing natural advantages such as an abundant supply of raw material, a sufficient supply of labour, or a large home market. . . . The natural advantages possessed by an Indian industry should be analysed carefully, in order to ensure as far as possible that no industry is protected which will become a permanent burden upon the community.
>
> (2) The industry must be one which without the help of protection either is not likely to develop at all or is not likely to develop as rapidly as is desirable in the interests of the country.
>
> (3) The industry must be one which will eventually be able to face world competition without protection. . . . The protection we contemplate is a temporary protection to be given to industries which will eventually be able to stand alone.

If safeguarding were limited on the lines recommended for India by the Fiscal Commission, most Unionist Free Traders and not a few Liberals and Socialists would regard it as a wise and unobjectionable measure.

The whole question has, however, taken on a new aspect owing to the stunts of two noble journalists. Lord Rothermere's campaign is of no particular interest, as it follows the general lines of Mr. Baldwin's policy in 1923. There is nothing new in the practice of assassinating a man and subsequently stealing his clothes, but in this case the motive for the assassination would seem to have been malice, and robbery has been a belated afterthought.

Lord Beaverbrook's Empire Crusade is on a different footing, and is a source of exquisite embarrassment to Unionists. They welcome the Empire Crusade, because it cannot fail to educate the Mother Country to the immense importance of the Dominion markets, but to have a discovery they made a quarter of a century ago represented as a new idea which will solve all problems puts them into the false position of having to depreciate what they regard as the chief plank in their platform.

When the idea of Empire Free Trade first sprang in all her lovely crudity from the brain of Lord Beaverbrook it definitely included the abolition of Dominion tariffs for British goods and a tax on foreign food and raw materials imported into Great Britain. The scheme was excellent, except that the British electorate will not tax foreign food and the Dominions will not untax British manufactures.

It is extraordinary that Lord Beaverbrook, a Canadian, should ever have pretended that there is any possibility of the Dominion of Canada agreeing to the free importation of manufactured goods from Great Britain. The two great parties are both Protectionist, and only the Progressives, in importance and numbers not even comparable with the English Liberal Party, are Free Traders. The Progressives represent the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and they stand for Free Trade, whether universal or Imperial, because Protection raises the cost of living all through the Dominion, while the grain that the prairie provinces export only obtains the price it will fetch in the world market. In those three provinces the party, whether called the Progressive or the Farmers' Party, is immensely strong, but at Ottawa it is always swamped by the Protectionists, whether Conservative or Liberal, from the manufacturing provinces of Quebec or Ontario. That this is inevitable is shown by the fact that Quebec returns sixty-five and Ontario eighty-two members to the House of Commons, while the three prairie provinces together return only fifty-four. Free Trade is no new idea in Canada, but it never has triumphed, and is never likely to triumph, over the vested interests of capital and labour intrenched in industrial Ontario and Quebec.

Precisely similar conditions obtain in Australia. There more

than half the population are concentrated in the six capital cities engaged in industries artificially built up and kept alive by high tariffs. Is it likely that Australia will agree to scrap these industries created at such great cost in order to admit British goods free of duty?

The high standard of living of the Australian people is almost entirely paid for by the agriculturist, and he, like the Canadian farmer, realises that his cost of production and living has been raised by Protection, while his own products have to face the cold blast of world competition outside the snug tariff walls which pamper the town dweller. The Country Party in Australia is in much the same position as the Progressive Party in Canada, and is not much more powerful, except when the hazard of the elections gives it the deciding voice between the two great Protectionist parties. If there were any doubt as to the unwillingness of Australia to agree to Empire Free Trade two recent pronouncements by the Prime Minister, Mr. Scullon, should have ended it. On January 31 he said: 'There is no hope in life of getting Australia to agree to allowing the goods of every part of the Empire to enter free.' He has even refused to send an Australian representative to the Tariff Conference at Geneva because 'it was the intention of the Government to go right ahead and strengthen its tariff walls wherever it could.'

The Tory Party has been preaching Imperial Preference for twenty-five years, and even the modest instalment proposed in 1923 was rejected by the electorate. It is a little provoking for men who have been labouring painfully and at no small cost for a lifetime to bridge a river to be accosted by a newcomer who accuses them of not having realised how valuable a bridge across the river would be, and with having overlooked the simplicity of making it. Faith may move mountains, but even the faith of Crusaders will not remove tariffs.

Lord Beaverbrook appears now to be convinced that Free Trade with the Dominions cannot be brought about at once, but, casting around for some raft to save him in the shipwreck, he has noted the dependent Empire. He rightly draws attention to the present importance and vast potential value of the British Colonial markets. In Africa there are 36,000,000, in Asia, excluding India, 14,000,000 under our rule or influence, and scattered over the other continents are territories which we administer. He rightly draws attention to the deplorable hold which foreign manufacturers have obtained in these markets which are kept secure by Britain, and which are increasing in value because of our enlightened and beneficent administration. The present writer has often noted while travelling in British Dependencies the disappointingly small share that British commerce enjoys in

those countries. Does this lead to the conclusion that we should close the trade of the dependent Empire to foreign countries?

To that school of thinkers who glory in the name Imperialist, the Empire is not an estate to be exploited by Great Britain in order to solve her economic problems. To us the subject Empire is in the strictest sense of the world a sacred trust. Our pride in the Empire comes from what we have given to it, not from what we have got out of it. The labourer is worthy of his hire, and we realise thankfully that what we have done to establish peace and good government in our Colonies, to educate and enrich and civilise the natives of those territories, has resulted in great markets springing up in which we enjoy a large share of the trade. We bitterly regret that that share is not larger. But we will have nothing to do with a policy which aims at compelling the Nigerian native to pay a higher price for cotton goods made in Lancashire than he would pay if he bought a loin-cloth made in New England.

New England—the very name reminds one that Lord Beaverbrook's new policy is the old policy which caused the American Colonies to secede. The authors of historical text-books write of Lord Beaverbrook's policy as it was applied two centuries ago:

> English statesmen strove so to regulate colonial trade that the greatest benefit should be conferred on England. From what we have seen of Mercantilist ideas, it is easy to lay down the principles applied. Colonies were encouraged to send home raw produce, such as sugar, tobacco, cotton-wool, indigo and dyes which could not be produced in England. But as colonies were to be used for the advantage of the mother-country, this advantage would be greatest if these goods were cheap and plentiful; accordingly these articles were 'enumerated' and prohibited from being sent to any but English ports. On the other hand, colonial export of such manufactured goods which could also be produced at home was held to be mischievous, and even those manufactures by which the colonies supplied their own wants were stopped. Thus the American colonists were not allowed to make beaver hats, though they could make them at little over one-third of the cost of the imported hats, because by doing so they diminished the market for English goods. . . . Thus hampered by restrictions as to what they exported, and where they sent it, prevented from selling in the best market, and forced to buy dear for the sake of a mother-country which many of them had never seen, the allegiance of the American colonists was exposed to a strain.

Many people who never tire of emphasising the vast field for British trade within the Empire will in no circumstances agree to fostering it by a method they regard as morally wrong, politically unwise, and economically unsound.

The cry for 'a policy,' good, bad, or indifferent, must be resisted by the Unionist Party, and Mr. Baldwin never showed greater statesmanship than in his speech at the Coliseum on

February 5. Great pressure was brought to bear on him, but he refused to commit his party to any nostrum, but outlined a sound but unspectacular programme.

There is now a need, and there will soon be a demand, for sane and intelligent administration, as opposed to legislative fireworks. Economy is becoming a pressing necessity, and some party must have the courage to call a halt to further social reform. More can be done to retain the home market by a policy of reorganisation and rationalisation than by any cunningly devised tariff, although temporary safeguarding duties need not be ruled out of the statesman's pharmacopœia. Improved marketing will go a long way to relieve the present depression in agriculture. The wise placing of capital and the development of research in connexion with agriculture, marketing, and packing will do more to promote inter-Imperial trade than any resuscitated mercantile policy. Whatever a Government can do must be done to cure the two principal causes of unemployment—lack of enterprise amongst employers and high labour costs. The latter will rarely be reduced by lowering wages, but can be reduced by increasing the efficiency of labour and by the substitution of mechanical power for muscle power.

A programme of this kind is not likely to arouse the wild enthusiasm of the masses, nor make sensational headlines for the cheap newspapers, but the Conservative Party can never hope to outbid the Socialists in popular programmes. We shall return to office when enthusiasm for the Labour Party has turned to bitter disillusionment. We do not need a policy in order to return to power: that we shall do automatically. The great need is for a policy to apply when we are again in office.

Hugh Molson.

SLUM CLEARANCE

One of the real difficulties in the way of dealing effectively with the slum problem to-day is the popularity of the phrase 'slum clearance.'

There is a growing determination on the part of the public to get rid of the slums. Owing to this unfortunate slogan, most people, including even members of housing committees and members of Parliament, instinctively think, not of the right solution, which is the building of new houses for the slum-dwellers, but merely of pulling down the existing slums. Even *The Times*, in a recent long leader,[1] rejects as of second-rate importance the building of new houses, and concludes that the Government's Bill will be a good Bill only if it abstains from spending money on the building of houses at low rents and devotes itself to the subject of slum clearance. But surely it requires very little reflection to see that the mere pulling down of houses is a simple and easy task. If this were all, then, in the words of the *Manchester Guardian* of January 24, 'with what robust and joyous blows of the pick and hammer would we smash up whole rows and terraces of wretched, badly built, and often already nearly ruinous houses.'

The really difficult task which confronts us is, not the mere destruction of slums, but the building of good houses into which we can move the 2,000,000 children who now live under slum conditions. That is our real social tragedy to-day. In spite of the immense efforts which have been made since the war, it is roughly true to say that there were about 2,000,000 children living under slum conditions at the time of the Armistice; that there are about the same number living under slum conditions to-day; and that the condition of the slums has, owing to the increasing age of the houses and the lack of adequate repairs, become substantially worse now than it was eleven years ago.

Even as regards overcrowding the condition of affairs has hardly improved. No local authority has, so far as I know, made any serious attempt to estimate the total amount of overcrowding in its slum areas. Two inquiries have, however, recently been

[1] *The Times*, January 18, 1930.

made in Manchester, one into 648 houses, the other into 1000 houses, and in each case it was found that no less than 27 per cent. of the houses were overcrowded in the worst sense; bedroom accommodation was so inadequate that young men and women were forced to sleep in the same room.

To illustrate concretely what this may mean, here is a case met with the other day in Salford by an experienced investigator. In a 'one-up and one-down' house lives a family comprising nine persons. In the only bedroom there are sleeping the husband and wife, three girls of twenty-two, six and two, and four boys of eighteen, sixteen, twelve and eight. The living-room opens directly off the street and is unsuitable for sleeping in, and in any case it is not the custom in provincial towns to use ground-floor rooms as bedrooms. This is an unusually bad case for Salford; for a father and mother, daughter of twenty-two, son of eighteen, and five other children to share one small bedroom is fortunately rare—at least, outside London and Glasgow. But it is no exaggeration to say that, quite apart from other forms of overcrowding, something like one-fourth of all the slum houses in the country fail to provide the necessary bedroom accommodation to separate adolescent boys and girls.

There is unanimous feeling in all sections of the public and among all political parties that these conditions must once and for all be swept away.

But the difficulties are tremendous. They are largely due to the astonishing development during the last twenty years of public opinion on the whole matter of slums and housing. This change of opinion has intensified the problem in two ways. On the one hand, bad housing and overcrowding, which existed before the war without raising much public protest, are to-day more and more strongly resented.

On the other hand, whereas we should have been content in pre-war days if the slum-dwellers could have been transferred to rows of the cheapest type of house, with no bath and no garden, to-day a completely new standard of working-class housing has been set. The adoption of the now well known 'Tudor Walters' type of house as the minimum house in which a working-class family should dwell is the greatest achievement of the post-war housing campaign. Public opinion now demands that, by a gradual process of building new houses and pulling down bad ones, the standard of housing should be raised until in the course of a generation or so every family should be living in a 'Tudor Walters' house—every child growing up in conditions compatible with full and healthy development of its bodily and mental powers.

We are faced, therefore, with an increasingly severe con-

destruction of slum houses and of overcrowding, and, at the same time, a great rise in the standard, and therefore in the cost, of the new houses which must be built.

In the meantime real wages have risen little, and the amount which workers are willing and able to pay as rent is, at least in the case of the poorer workers, quite inadequate to pay the economic rent of what is now regarded as the cheapest adequate family house.

A strenuous effort has been made since the war to meet these novel and difficult demands, and we have actually succeeded in building nearly 1,500,000 houses. The magnitude of this national effort will be appreciated when it is realised that, if we continue building houses at the present rate for another two or three years, we shall have spent on our national post-war housing campaign a capital sum of no less than 1,000,000,000*l*. It is tragic that, in spite of this colossal building programme, we have as yet hardly touched the fringe of the slum problem.

The reason for this failure is simple. None of the houses which have been built has been cheap enough for the poorer slum-dwellers to occupy. They have been let at inclusive rents of 10*s*. and upwards, and are occupied mainly by the clerk and artisan class. An analysis has recently been made of the occupations of the tenants of the 12,000 houses built by the Manchester Corporation since the war. No less than 40 per cent. of them belong to what may be called the clerk class, who occupy on the whole the parlour houses and the more expensive non-parlour houses; 50 per cent. belong to the artisan class, and just over 10 per cent. are labourers. Of these labourers it may be taken that most of them have very small families and are working in the sheltered trades where labourers get from 50*s*. to 60*s*. a week.

Those who have benefited by the national expenditure of nearly 1,000,000,000*l*. and by the very large subsidies which have been granted have been the fairly well-off; not the poorest classes who need most help—especially not those members of the poorer classes who have large families. Even municipal authorities, when they come to let houses, tend, like any other landlord, to forget the slum problem and to let the houses to the most eligible tenant—that is to say, to the applicant who has most money and fewest children.

To sum up, therefore, we have gone a long way to meet the housing problem of the artisan and the clerk; as regards the labourer, we have provided houses for a few of the labourers in sheltered industries with small families; we have done nothing for the more poorly paid unskilled worker, and have done nothing to reduce the number of children living in the slums. Those

children form the crux of the housing problem. If they could be removed from the slums into good houses, with space to live and play, with plenty of sun and light and air, we could regard the housing problem as solved. The removal of these 2,000,000 children from the slums is by far the greatest public health reform that remains to be carried through.

There is, then, general agreement as to the object we have in view—to clear the 2,000,000 children out of the slums. When, however, we come to consider the means of doing this, we find that there are, unfortunately, two diametrically opposed views, which we may call, for want of better names, the *laissez-faire* view and the constructive view respectively.

The *laissez-faire* view was well set forth in the leader in *The Times* already referred to, which states that 'the housing situation is really not unhealthy, if measured by the needs of the present and the achievements of the past. . . . There is really no reason why the price of houses should not be brought down to 260*l*. At that price the economic rent works out at 6*s*. a week.' The writer draws from this the conclusion that there is not much trouble about building new houses; what is wanted is the reconditioning of existing houses, better compensation for owners of good property in slum areas, and an active policy of demolishing slum houses.

The advocates of the *laissez-faire* policy recognise as clearly as anyone else that slums can only be pulled down after the inhabitants have been transferred to new houses. Their advocacy of immediate slum clearance is based, as shown in *The Times* leader, on the belief that cheap houses within the means of the slum-dweller can be built without further State help. If this were so, all housing reformers would accept their view. Unfortunately, however, the figures given by *The Times* leader writer are based on a series of mistakes, and are very far from the truth.

(1) He has taken the cost of the family house to be 260*l*., whereas in fact the average cost is about 340*l*., and, according to authoritative opinions, there is no reason to expect any substantial reduction of this figure unless the size or quality of the house is cut down.

(2) He has omitted the cost of the land, roads and drains, which average about 60*l*., so that the real cost of the house for purposes of calculating the rent is not 340*l*., but 400*l*.

(3) He has omitted to include rates, which average 3*s*. a week on such a house.

By this astonishing series of errors *The Times* arrives at an economic rent of 6*s*. a week. The actual economic rent is shown in the following table:—

	s.	d.
Interest on 400*l.* at 5 per cent.	7	8
Sinking fund at 6 per cent.	0	10
Maintenance, etc.	2	6
	11	0
Rates	3	0
	14	0

If the case of those who believe no further subsidies to be necessary has to be bolstered up by so extraordinary a series of miscalculations it seems fairly obvious that the case must be a weak one.

But there is another, and perhaps more dangerous, variation of the *laissez-faire* policy. There is a school of thought which holds that there are two distinct problems—housing on the one hand, and poverty on the other. We should concentrate our efforts on raising wages, and the slum problem would then solve itself. Good houses should be built for those who can afford to pay an economic rent; those who cannot afford it are the defectives and derelicts, who should be dealt with by the public assistance committees.

Let us consider for a moment the case of the engineering labourer whose wages average just over 40*s.* a week. He is, generally speaking, as industrious a worker and as good a citizen as anybody else; he is in his present position mainly because he never had the chance of an apprenticeship which would enable him to become a skilled worker. And yet, if he has a wife and three children to maintain, it is utterly impossible for him to keep his family fit and healthy and at the same time pay more than the slum rent of, say, 7*s.* a week.

It is easy to say that his wages should go up; but engineering is an export trade, and wages are determined largely by the world level. Our keenest competitors are the Germans, and the engineering labourer there gets, not 40*s.*, but 30*s.*, a week. In these circumstances we are slowly losing our export trade to Germany, and so long as German wages remain at the present level our wages are more likely to move downwards rather than upwards.

To say, therefore, that we should wait for wages to rise is simply to leave things as they are, and to ensure that every engineering labourer with a family shall continue to live in a slum house. This policy is nothing more nor less than an evasion and postponement of the whole difficulty.

The alternative view, held by the great majority of those who

are determined to abolish the slums, and who have thoroughly studied the problems involved, is that the solution depends almost entirely on the provision of good family houses at rents which the present slum-dwellers can pay, and built in places where the cost of transport will not be excessive.

This view is set out in a pamphlet, *A Policy for the Slums*,[1] published a few months ago by a special committee of the National Housing and Town Planning Association, which included members of all political parties and persons with experience in nearly all branches of housing. That under such conditions the report was unanimous must give it considerable weight.

The broad conclusions of the report were to the effect that we needed a large number of family houses at from 10*s*. to 15*s*. inclusive rent, to house the artisan class, and another large number at from 6*s*. to 10*s*. inclusive rent to house the families of the unskilled workers. If during the next ten years 500,000 of each of these types of houses were built by the municipalities, and were let, as far as possible, to parents of large families, then the back of the slum problem would be broken. There should be by that time between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 children living in those houses, the greater portion of whom should have come from slum conditions; the overcrowding in the slums would have largely disappeared, and the process of pulling down the old houses could then be tackled with full vigour.

The report estimates that with the present subsidy a decent family house can be let at about 10*s*. inclusive rent. The 'artisan' problem can therefore be solved without further action by the Government; all that is needed is for the municipalities to take full advantage of the present subsidy and build family houses to be let at an inclusive rent of 10*s*.

In this connexion I would point out that Birmingham and many smaller towns are to-day building and letting family houses at 10*s*. Other towns are charging not less than 12*s*., and in some cases 14*s*., thus putting the houses beyond the reach of many who need them most. For instance, in Manchester the non-parlour house, which (including land, etc.) is costing about 400*l*. on the average throughout the country, is to-day actually being built at a cost of about 500*l*. No doubt the house is a better one, but the rent is about 15*s*., and it is not serving the purpose of housing the artisan, who in many cases cannot afford more than 10*s*.

Further than this, many municipalities, instead of giving preference to the large family, are, as above stated, giving preference to the 'good' tenant—the tenant who can be most safely relied on to pay the rent regularly; and, unfortunately, the larger the family the harder this is to do.

[1] P. S. King & Son, Ltd. (6*d*.).

These two lines of policy must be accepted by the local authorities if they are going to clear the children out of the slums; more houses must be built at lower rents, and a preference must be given to the largest families. I hasten to add that although Manchester, in my opinion, errs in these matters, there are many municipalities which are to-day pursuing the right policy in both directions.

The report referred to proceeds to consider the case of the labourer's house, which should be let round about 7*s.* a week inclusive. The 'artisan' house is, according to the report, the cheapest family house which should be built to-day—the 'minimum standard house.' The labourer's house must therefore be the same house let at a lower rent. This cannot be done without new legislation. The question is, what is the cheapest form of subsidy under which the minimum standard house can be let at 7*s.* inclusive rent?

The conclusion of the report is that this can best be done by some system of rent allowances based on the number of children in the family. The extra subsidy is only required in the case of large families, and should therefore be confined to these families. Further, the larger the family the harder it is for the father to find money for the rent; therefore the larger should be the subsidy. If it is desired to get the large families out of the slums, and to do it as cheaply as possible, an examination of the economic situation makes it clear that this can only be done by basing the subsidy on the number of children.

This is a conclusion which most people, on first consideration, instinctively dislike. There were about thirty members of the committee which was responsible for *A Policy for the Slums*; probably twenty-five of them were hostile to the system of children's rent allowances when the committee first began to sit. After several months' consideration they unanimously signed the report strongly recommending the adoption of such a system.

There is no space here to go into the whole of the arguments for and against children's rent allowances; I hope that all those interested will read *A Policy for the Slums*, in which they are fully set forth. I believe that anybody who closely studies this question will, by sheer force of economic facts, be driven to the conclusion that some such system is inevitable if we are to get the children out of the slums, and if we are to do it as economically as possible.

The Times concludes its leader on 'The New Problem in Housing' by saying that the Government's new Bill will be a good one only if it concentrates on the clearance of existing slums. This summarises the attitude of the *laissez-faire* reformers. Those whom I have called the constructive housing reformers

regard this as the exact reverse of the truth. We believe that the Bill will be a good one only if it concentrates on providin good family houses at low rents, and on making such arrangements that the 2,000,000 children will be drawn from the slums into these houses; and we believe that this can be done most effectively and cheaply by a well-devised system of Children' Rent Allowances.

E. D. Simon.

RETRENCHMENT AND PROSPERITY

PEACE, Retrenchment, and Reform: where do they stand to-day? Peace is the universal platform, whatever mental reservations old-fashioned statesmen may make here and there, and what is everybody's slogan is nobody's. Reform, in the sense that made it a burning question a century ago, has worked itself out to its logical conclusion in man and womanhood suffrage. And Retrenchment? Hear Viscount Grey:

> The whole situation has changed. To-day the three parties are not really opponents, but competitors, and, for reasons which we all sympathise with and understand, they are all advocating progressive policies. What happened at the last election? . . . Parties are outbidding each other in the race for expenditure, and each Government comes in pledged to add to the public expenditure. It seems to me we ought to realise that great change in our politics and the danger of it. We are drifting, I think, into a very unsafe and dangerous commitment as regards public expenditure. (January 14, 1930.)

Individual election addresses may still pay the traditional homage to economy, but it is no longer a power in the policy of any party because the 'practical politician,' whatever his colour, believes that only a direct appeal to the voter's pocket will win.

As an arithmetical text for Viscount Grey's discourse, take the following figures, from the Statements circulated on recent Budget nights:

Head.	Description.	1914.		1929.	
		£ millions.	Percentage of total.	£ millions.	Percentage of total.
1	Interest on debt . .	17	*8*	305	*37*
2	Sinking Fund . .	7	*4*	50	*6*
3	Pensions and insurance .	27	*13*	140	*17*
4	Grants, including Ireland	37	*18*	115	*14*
5	Post Office and Road Fund	26	*13*	77	*9*
6	Defence . . .	74	*36*	96	*12*
7	Civil and other services .	16	*8*	39	*5*
		204	*100*	822	*100*

Figures which might well have inspired any new Government with determination to set a better example. But so true is it that economy has fled from Westminster, that a Government without a majority has already been allowed to increase expenditure by 8,000,000*l.* this financial year and 19,000,000*l.* next; and almost entirely in ways that appeal directly to the pocket: 12,000,000*l.* for the unemployed, 5,000,000*l.* for widows, over 1,000,000*l.* for Government servants by waiving reductions of pay due for lower cost of living, and annual paid holidays for wage-earners. Codlin's the friend, not Short. Mr. Snowden, who once condemned anything over his own modest 1924 total of 790,000,000*l.* as extravagant, now joins enthusiastically in the big break competition. He may make more play with the red, while Mr. Churchill shows more fondness for cannons, but they both play in free style, and Mr. Snowden's next visit to the table is eagerly awaited by his backers.

In comparisons with 1914 allowance must, of course, be made for the rise in price-levels, and for a rough measure of the growth of the taxpayer's burden we may add 55 per cent.[1] to the 1914 total, making it 316,000,000*l.* The 1929 burden of 822,000,000*l.* is thus more than two and a half times as heavy, without Mr. Snowden's last straw. What prospects are there of retrenchment under the several heads?

1 and 2. *Service of the Debt.*—This year's Budget set up a fixed annuity of 355,000,000*l.* for amortisation of the debt (7,600,000,000*l.*), starting with 304,600,000*l.* for interest and 50,400,000*l.* for Sinking Fund. A slow start, with so big a total; but if it could have been carried out, the 50,000,000*l.* for capital redemption increasing year by year as interest diminished, we should before long have made a real impression on the debt and the national credit would have improved, enabling us to convert loans to lower rates of interest and so to accelerate the process. But though Mr. Churchill for five years provided (on paper) an annual 50,000,000*l.* or more for redemption, the charge for interest this year will exceed the 305,000,000*l.* in his first Budget, and the actual extinction of debt will fall short of the programme. The national credit stands so low that his successor has had to exchange 5 per cent. War Loan for a longer-dated 5 per cent. security at par. Mr. Snowden must clearly make a fresh start, at a figure which can hardly be lower in any event than 355,000,000*l.* There is no present prospect of relief under these heads.

3. *Pensions and Insurance.*—The total of 132,000,000*l.* for 1929 shown in the Budget Statement included 54,000,000*l.* for

[1] About the mean of the general increase in wages (70 to 75 per cent.) and the rise in wholesale prices other than food (34 per cent.). (Board of Trade figures.)

war pensions, 17,000,000*l.* for other Army, Navy and Air Force pensions, 35,000,000*l.* for old age pensions, 4,000,000*l.* for the State contribution to the 1925 scheme of 'national' pensions to widows, etc., and 4,000,000*l.* for other pensions, mainly Civil Service, together with 18,000,000*l.* for grants to health and unemployment insurance schemes: but 4,000,000*l.* for Post Office pensions were left under head 5 and 4,000,000*l.* for teachers' and police pensions under head 4. The reasons for this difference of arrangement have no application to our present purpose, and the 8,000,000*l.* are here included.

In 1924 the fact that the war pensions (then 69,000,000*l.*) must disappear in two generations was the one strong feature in the position. What a foundation for a sinking fund! 'Instead of which,' the Conservatives converted the burden into a perpetual charge by their scheme of 'contributory' pensions, which soaks up the savings as war pensions die out; and now 5,000,000*l.* a year is clapped on by going back to pick up widows whose dates had excluded them. This 5,000,000*l.* is not permanently added to the cost of the scheme and will taper off as the old-date widows die; but for years to come the annual charge is made heavier. Grants of war pension were subject to periodical revision for cost of living, but on the first occasion it was announced that so wealthy a nation would forgo the adjustment. No subsequent Minister could fall short of this generosity, and the provision is a dead letter. The new Government (as already mentioned) has extended the precedent to cases without the special claims of the wounded warrior.

The 'service' pensions of the fighting forces must increase for years to come, because it takes forty years or more for an increase in strengths to produce its full effect on them, so that the growth of the Army and Navy at the turn of the century is still being felt, and the Air Force pensions are scarcely begun. Higher rates of pension were also granted after the war, so that those now added to the list are larger than those terminating; and the convivial service pensioner, whose habits made his life as short as (let us hope) it was merry, has been replaced by a later pattern, enjoying the proverbially long life of the annuitant. The same causes, with the rapid growth of the Civil Service and the grant of pension rights to new classes, make the prospects in that direction equally unfavourable to the Budget. The prolongation of middle age—the average man of to-day can give his grandfather five years and a beating at any physical test—would justify extending the working life to pay for the longer pension, but the tendency is all the other way. Early retirements are popular with the majority in all services because they stimulate promotion, and with administrators because they ease the diffi-

culty of the moderately useless man—the eternal problem of all public employments. In addition, the working hours of life are curtailed by the shorter week, and now again by the coming prolongation of the school period; and there is with us no such increased productivity in industry as might enable the longer unproductive periods to be supported. We are burning the candle at both ends and scraping it down in the middle.

The insurance (health and unemployment) contributions here included are those ordinarily due by the State under the contributory schemes. Special grants and doles to those out of insurance fall under heads 4 and 7; but the distinction has become blurred, and we may note here the fresh addition of 12,000,000*l.* for 1930. There is no going back, and the large automatic increases on this head form the worst feature in a critical situation. The palm for heedless extravagance must go to the Conservative Government of 1925, though they may plead that, had either of their competitors had the chance, as bad or worse might have happened.

4. *Grants.*—Of these contributions to services administered by local authorities the largest are education (47,000,000*l.*, excluding pensions), the old local taxation accounts (15,000,000*l.*), the new contributions for rating relief, etc. (15,000,000*l.*), housing (13,000,000*l.*) and police (6,000,000*l.*, excluding pensions). Among the numerous minor items is one of 2,000,000*l.* for special unemployment grants and loans. Grant expenditure is mainly governed by Acts of Parliament defining the taxpayer's liability as a fixed sum or proportion of total expenditure, or on some other principle, and is thus not directly controllable by Parliament from year to year, but subject to review at intervals as a matter of policy. Education grants must be considerably increased by the higher school-leaving age, with maintenance grants. Housing consists of various annual subventions, with now from fourteen to fifty years or more to run, and there is a serious risk of increase in connexion with slum clearance. Some of the minor grants may drop out or be reduced before long, but the line between rates and taxes ceased to be logical long ago; for the majority of voters the ratepayer's interests outweigh the taxpayer's, and there is constant pressure to shift the line against the latter on the plea that incidence of the burdens is unequal. A special feature next year will be the new rating relief contributions, which will then come into full operation. A rough idea of the effect is given by the statement that if the scheme had been fully applied in 1926 no less than 29,000,000*l.* in England and Wales would have been shifted from rates to taxes, to say nothing of Scotland. Owing to Mr. Churchill's forethought in raising money in advance for a flying start—which Mr. Snowden rather ungraciously represents as robbing the Sinking Fund—the latter will have

funds in hand for 1930, but warns us that, having then swallowed his plum, he will want an extra 15,000,000*l.* in 1931. Thus this head, as a whole, is pledged to a large and permanent increase.

To be seen in proper perspective the figures under heads 3 and 4 should be read with the annual *Return of Total Expenditure on Public Social Services*, a document which instead of being sold on demand at 3*d.* a copy ought to be posted in broadsheet form on all places of worship and municipal buildings. The following figures are taken from it:

GREAT BRITAIN

Year.	Total Expenditure, excluding Capital out of Loans.	Money found from			
		Taxes.	Rates.	Contributions, Fees, etc.	Total.
	£ millions.	£ millions.	£ millions.	£ millions.	£ millions.
1911	55	28	31	4	63
1925	338	177	79	91	347
1927	383	179*	97	123	399*
1928	366	181*	89	113	383*

* Each of these figures includes the sum of 4,000,000*l.* paid annually from the Exchequer into the Treasury Pensions Account under the contributory pensions scheme. These payments are noted in the return, but not included in the totals.

We already spend over a million a day on various forms of Public Assistance, of which the taxpayer bears almost exactly half and the ratepayer a quarter, while the potential beneficiaries and their employers contribute jointly something more than the remaining quarter, the surplus (under health insurance) being carried forward to meet the actuarial liability to more sickness in the later years of life. The unemployment fund instead of a surplus has accumulated a deficit in the neighbourhood of 40,000,000*l.*

5. *Post Office and Road Fund.*—Of these services, classed in the Budget as 'self-supporting,' the former earns from the public (at monopoly rates) enough to cover all its expenses (including pensions) and 9,000,000*l.* of net revenue besides. It employs more than half the Civil Service and is continually expanding as its work grows. As to whether it could work more cheaply, it is in the same position as the rest of the Civil Service, which comes for consideration under head 7; but here there is no possibility of saving by reducing the work itself. It will continue to grow, but with good management the net (as well as the gross) revenue should grow with it. The Road Fund is merely a reversion to the bad old custom of assigning particular revenues (motor vehicle duties) to particular services (grants for making and maintaining

roads). Nothing is earmarked, so that there are possibilities not only of cheapening the work, but of reducing it, for this would not lessen the produce of the duties. The outcry against Mr Churchill's decision to allow the taxpayer some benefit from the duties would doubtless be repeated, but in this crisis of our finances it is neither necessary to spend over 22,000,000*l.* a year in perpetuity to make and keep roads fit for high-speed traffic nor arguable that there is no taxable element of luxury in motor transport. More vehicles are bringing more receipts, and the net balance (now 4,750,000*l.*) taken to revenue might well be increased, unless the expenditure is kept up for the purpose of creating employment.

6. *Defence (excluding Pensions)*.—The figures show a nominal increase of 23,000,000*l.*, or 31 per cent. of the 1914 figure, but adding 55 per cent. to the latter for price levels, there is really a reduction of 17,000,000*l.*, or 23 per cent.,[8] though defence is now a problem in three dimensions, not in two. Mr. MacDonald in his broadcast message to America on January 22 gave our contributions to disarmament, already effected, as 50,000 men off the Regular Army of 1914, and in the Navy capital ships reduced from 69 to 20, cruisers from 108 to 54 and submarines from 74 to 53. These figures are a warning that we have already gone as far as we ought towards disarmament, unless by international agreement. Even then, the discharge of fighting men, stoppage of recruiting, or restriction of shipbuilding and munitions all increase unemployment unless both men and money are reabsorbed in productive industry; and if the money saved is not added to the Sinking Fund, or in other ways returned 'to fructify in the pocket of the taxpayer,' but spent on extra doles, there is no reabsorption. Social services may be the economic equivalent of digging holes and filling them up again, just as truly as the building and manning of warships. While, therefore, there are future possibilities of retrenchment under this head, especially on the naval side, to expect any large immediate relief would be sanguine.

7. *Civil and all other Services*.—In this 39,000,000*l.* are included 4,500,000*l.* for works and buildings, 3,000,000*l.* for beet sugar subsidy, 1,000,000*l.* for training and transfer of unemployed, and various other small items totalling 5,000,000*l.*, 11,000,000*l.* for tax collection, and 14,000,000*l.* for the cost of civil government generally, including judicial, diplomatic, financial and administrative functions. The beet subsidy and some of the other minor items should fall out before long, giving savings if the money is not taken for new expenditure. Of the two large

[8] This is rather an understatement, as for this particular class of expenditure the large increases of pay to soldiers and sailors raise the price level more than 55 per cent.

tions the principal ingredient in the cost of the Civil Service. Mr. Churchill's dream of 1928, that by reducing the number of officials he would make savings to balance the automatic increases to which he had become alive, has vanished. With continual additions to the work of the Service, caused by fresh legislation and more searching taxation, with constant pressure from below for better conditions, the cost is increasing and will increase so long as the present methods of work and administration continue. A Royal Commission on the Service is sitting, but, as far as can be judged from published reports, its attention has not yet been directed to possibilities of economy; and Mr. Snowden, as we have seen, is not prepared to hold the Service to the prescribed reductions for cost of living. There are only two possibilities of appreciable economy: to persuade Parliament that some of the work it has piled upon the Service is not now worth its cost, and a radical reform of its methods of work, especially financial. The Treasury exists to control all Government expenditure, and, urged by the Public Accounts Committee and the Audit Office, its able officers make superhuman efforts to do it in minute detail, at heavy cost in excessive centralisation, vain repetition of work and multiplication of higher officials, who, owing to the consuming passion for Treasury authority, are denied responsibility adequate to their status. I believe these possibilities to be important; but they open questions too big to be discussed here. Without such action there is small prospect of retrenchment on this head as a whole.

To sum up this analysis, our expenditure falls into three broad classes: that to which the nation is finally pledged; that over which Parliament retains, in the shape of periodical review, some share of control; and that which in theory it can vary from year to year, downwards as well as upwards. The figures, not including Mr. Snowden's additions, are:

Class.	Heads of former table.	1914.		1929.	
		£ millions.	Per cent. of total.	£ millions.	Per cent. of total.
I. . .	1 and 3	44	*22*	445	*58*
II. .	4 and 5	63	*32*	192	*25*
III. .	6 and 7	90	*46*	135	*17*
	Total	197	*100*	772	*100*

Sinking fund is here omitted because, though one element in taxation, it is not expenditure, but a promise to apply a surplus, if realised.

More than half of our expenditure is entirely beyond control, except in the sense that a man can control his debts by paying them; and only one-sixth of it is even in theory under full control, as against almost half in 1914. Reckless mortgaging of the economic future for the political interests of the moment has brought us within reach of the vicious circle: only lower interest on the debt can reduce our expenditure, and only reduction of our expenditure can lower the interest on the debt.

Twenty years ago, when the health and unemployment insurance schemes were started, the national income and accumulated wealth at home and abroad were rapidly increasing, under taxation that now seems incredibly light. If the shadow that then hung over Europe would not allow us to meet the cost by savings elsewhere, there were large available reserves of taxable capacity. But to-day the situation is altogether changed. We are overtaxed; the produce per penny of the income tax, the total income assessed to super-tax and the yield of that tax are alike falling. Slackness of trade is not the only cause. The steeply graduated taxation of large incomes and accumulated capital, under the great redistribution of the national income that has taken place since 1914, is beginning to defeat its own ends; for with a given total national income, if there is a downward movement from the top of the scale towards the bottom, the produce of the taxes grows less and less without any change in the standard rate; and if the top rates are increased to balance the shrinkage, the process is only hastened. A large mass of wealth has in fact moved towards the exemption end of the scale; the wage-earner has gained proportionately more than the professional man and the unskilled wage-earner than the skilled. Satisfaction at the under-dog's luck must not obscure the financial effects, and the immediate loss of revenue to the Exchequer is not the only drawback. Wealth is like heat; evenly distributed it is excellent for comfort, but however much of it you may have, you can get no power out of it unless there are inequalities; uniformity means stagnation and death. So with uniform distribution of wealth (which would only add a few shillings a week to average wages) industrial progress would cease, for that depends on the continual accumulation of fresh capital, which, in the world as we know it, means saving by individuals; and, without claiming moral excellence for savings made from overflowing incomes, it is certain that if all shared alike the general level of consumption would rise to that of production and there would be no savings worth mention. This is not mere theory; the tendency is operating to-day, as all authorities agree. Sir Josiah Stamp recently said 'at the present time we are suffering from capital-hunger. Our rate of progress could and should be more rapid if capital were more

abundant.'[1] The president of the Royal Statistical Society, calculating from the 1924 Census of Production, has found that national savings per head of population are now over 40 per cent. below the 1907 level. Further confirmation is found in the figures for 'balance of trade,' in which the excess of the 'visible' outgoings (imports) over the incomings (exports) is set against the 'invisible' net income derived from shipping, investments abroad, and other monetary transactions, to show the net results of our dealings overseas A favourable balance of 54,000,000*l.* in 1925 had become an adverse balance of 12,000,000*l* in 1926—an abnormal year, but a result so disquieting that Sir Robert Kindersley investigated afresh the 'invisible' items, which are not on record, but have to be estimated by experts from various data. He made the balance for 1926 9,000,000*l.* in our favour, and for 1928 149,000,000*l.*: less alarming figures, but as 'invisible' income is nearly stationary and the adverse balance of visible imports over exports for 1929 (382,000,000*l.*) is some 30,000,000*l.* greater than for 1928, we seem to be still losing ground; at all events, prosperity has not returned.

In handling this position we have for years been treating the symptom unemployment, and not the disease which causes it. It is a step in the right direction that the luckless Minister told off to redeem the gaily-given election pledge that a cure was ready to hand has frankly owned up that there is none; but it still remains to get at the root. Our statesmen have set out to create a new heaven and a new earth by relegating to Saturn political economy, 'the dismal science.' They have derided it as an inhuman gospel teaching that the whole duty of man is to buy everything, including labour, in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, whereas it does not claim to be a code of ethics, but to demonstrate the 'laws' by which, so far as men are moved by economic motives, certain consequences may be predicted from certain antecedents. Left to the free play of these laws, things have ways of righting themselves. Thus, under the law of 'supply and demand,' scarcity raises prices, high prices stimulate production, and the scarcity is relieved; superabundance lowers prices, low prices discourage production, and overstocking ceases. In the Great War uneconomic action sank our ships till high prices for food could not increase the supply, and the law threatened to equate demand with supply in a grimmer way—by starvation. As the only alternative, a vast system of Government rationing and control had to be elaborated to produce an artificial distribution, equitable indeed as between man and man; but what a contrast between the quiet efficiency of economic self-regulation and the fuss and officialdom and cost of 'Dora'! Forty years ago

[1] Evidence before the Licensing Commission, February 1930.

employment had also a self-righting tendency. Any trade can find profitable employment for more men at lower wages than at higher, because low prices of its products stimulate consumption. When the employer's selling prices fell, the unions were strong enough to see that he did not simply cut wages; but if profits fell to the point at which he must shorten hands or lose money the workmen had to choose at the risk of their own funds whether to accept lower wages till things were better or to stand firm and face unemployment. The time factor was important, and a reduction promptly accepted before the market was lost might pay the workman better than nominally higher wages with short time or unemployment. When the market improved, it paid the employer to get his plant back to full running at the old wages, unemployment ceased, and with further improvement the demand for labour would raise wages still higher. The economic regulator thus outlined was not a 'ratchet' mechanism, moving wages only downward, but a 'governor' acting up or down as circumstances required. But the provision of unemployment benefit, largely at the cost of the employer and the Exchequer, greatly increased the resources of the workmen; the war soon enlarged their political influence and important trades lost all sense of the relation between profits, wages, and a competitive world market. Short of a strike (when unemployment benefit is not paid) the men and their unions could bear a considerable percentage of unemployment for long periods; wage negotiations stiffened and were prolonged till Government should intervene. The economic governor has ceased to act, or is delayed until the market is lost, and it is harder to recapture a market than to retain it. We see the results of what Professor Cannan has described as 'proposing remedies for economic pressure without considering whether the pressure may not be an integral part of the existing organisation, which cannot be removed without causing disaster unless some efficient substitute is provided'; and we have provided none.

Lassalle's 'iron law' that capitalist wages must always be at or near 'subsistence level' may be quoted to prove that no reduction of wages, even temporary, can be contemplated; but those words, in their plain sense of 'sufficient to keep body and soul together,' being obviously untrue, are interpreted by up-to-date Socialists to mean the conventional standard of life at a given time and place.[4] Very well; but then the famous law is the mere truism that spending follows close on spending-power—the very cause (as we have seen) of the drop in national savings. But the facts are not so depressing. Measuring from the 1914 level, the rise in cost of living, which in 1920 had been 149 per

[4] *The Modern Case for Socialism* (A. W. Humphrey).

cent., was in [illegible] per cent., and continues to fall. In the same period the general average of wage rates rose by 70 to 75 per cent., so that real wages (the things money wages will buy) have risen, notwithstanding the existing severe depression and a very general reduction in hours of work. In sheltered industries, such as building, railways, docks, printing, wage rates rose 100 per cent. or more, while great exporting industries such as coal, iron and steel, engineering, shipbuilding, fared much worse; but in all industries the workers profited by the vast expenditure on social services. Allowing for a 60 per cent. rise in prices since 1911, the increase in these services, after deducting the workers' own contributions to insurance, has added more than 200,000,000*l.* to their emoluments.

The above figures bring out a second maladjustment from which industry is suffering owing to the intrusion of political forces into the economic sphere. The world prices our exports realise, which are not governed by the conditions in these islands, have to be shared by the producing industries with sheltered industries, such as building, railways and docks, which take their toll as a first charge on the prices, production keeping the balance. The high sheltered wages thus depress those of the miner or factory hand as surely as a reduction forced on him by his employer, but without the better employment or competitive power which the latter might bring. The pegging of railway rates at a level to enable the companies to pay wages out of proportion to the general prosperity of industry is acting like the clumsiest of export taxes. With a fairer distribution between sheltered and manufacturing or mining wages, the average level, with the social services provided in kind and the shorter hours, would leave plenty of room for a contribution by the worker to the restoration of the self-adjusting principles in industry. This does not mean abolishing unemployment benefit; but it should be confined to what can be provided by a real insurance fund with strictly limited powers of borrowing to meet the temporary depressions of the trade cycle; and neither taxes nor rates should be held liable to support indefinitely men in idleness when the plain fact is that the union rates of wages, under the working hours, limitation of individual output and other conditions insisted upon, have outrun the productivity of the industry concerned.

It is nowise suggested that a return to some economic regulator for wages is the first or only remedy required at the pass to which we are now come. Rationalisation by aggregation of uneconomic units, technical improvements, cutting of losses already made but not faced, and on the side of the workmen by full acceptance of such methods of lowering labour costs without reducing wages as piece work or other forms of payment by results—all these are

called for. But such methods, as well as combinations to create prosperity by contriving scarcity, are not new in themselves, though the present need for their simultaneous application is unprecedented; and when, with their help, industry has been set once more on its feet, the same political pressure to raise the standard of living still higher—'this is only an instalment,' Ministers have told us—will again produce the same economic disasters unless some regulating mechanism is included in the organisation of industry itself. You cannot indefinitely repeat 'rationalisation' at the expense of capital, for no one has yet discovered a sure method of confining that to an island; and ultimately the question must be faced whether wages at a standard fixed extrinsically are (as Socialism would have it) in all circumstances the first charge on the products of industry, or whether (as the existing system postulates) the standard must in the long run be determined by the abundance of the products. The unlimited inflation of public assistance belongs logically to the Socialist scheme, which, when it can no longer live parasitically upon a 'capitalist' host in process of decline, must in some way which nobody has ever quite succeeded in explaining or putting into practice, balance such extravagances by obtaining the advantages of capital without paying for them. For the present, Socialism is busy distributing to its supporters the promised rewards, leaving to the future this difficult problem of capital. The two old parties, both pledged to the main lines of the existing system, have nevertheless tried to graft on to it the popular features of their rivals' programme and have shirked the unpopular job of getting 'Industry, Limited' back on to a sound basis by either increasing the earnings or reducing the distribution. So it comes about that, English fashion, all three parties take a middle course combining the expensive features of both systems. No plan so illogical can be followed much further without ending in disaster, whatever party may be in office; and that (as it seems to me) is the real disease of which our present inveterate unemployment is only a symptom.

As we stand we can hardly retrench even enough to meet the automatic growth of present commitments; and to pull through at all we should resolutely avoid all new expenditure, while we work to restore prosperity to industry, rationalising not only in the share markets but in the works themselves, and looking hopefully for new light from the Economic Advisory Council and the organised conferences of employers and trade unionists. But if we are to avoid relapses we must also rationalise the financial methods of Parliament. They have so long been held up as a model that we do not realise how completely obsolete and futile they are under present conditions; and it is impossible not to ask whether

their peculiarities have not something to do with our present plight. Other peoples, strangers neither to democracy nor to advocacy of Socialism, have control of their expenditure through their elected representatives, and are not steering for bankruptcy; on the contrary, both France and Germany are considering substantial remissions in taxation already lighter than ours. We alone of nations constitutionally governed must bear whatever expenditure may be decreed by a Cabinet only one member of which can be expected to look beyond the political and administrative interests of the immediate future. 'So far as the direct control of expenditure is concerned,' writes Sir Herbert Samuel, 'the Estimates might as well not be submitted to Parliament at all'[5]; and a writer well acquainted with the theory and practice of our system sums it up as 'a whited sepulchre hiding the corpse of national economy.'[6] The Estimates are laid without the slightest intimation as to how much new revenue they involve. This absurdity is wrapped up, under the attractive name of 'secrecy of the Budget,' with the necessity of not divulging intended new duties lest merchants should manipulate clearances. Once laid, the Estimates must be voted without altering a figure, under threat of resignation and dissolution. The value of our Estimates Committee appears from the fact that Estimates are voted without waiting for its reports. That there is no Second Chamber revision makes a real committee stage essential. The ancient prerogative of the Crown to determine the rewards and punishments of its servants is invoked to cover the announcement by Government, without consultation with Parliament, of any change, however costly, in their emoluments. Successive Governments proclaim the House incapable of controlling expenditure and laud Treasury control instead—with tongue in cheek, for Treasury control over Ministers cannot exist. What evidence of such control was there in the excessive post-war increases of pay to the fighting services, in the great growth of cost of the Civil Service, in Mr. Snowden's new *largesse* to all, or even in the gift announced in 1926 of 200,000*l.* to the Civil Service for sports grounds, which the good sense of the Service declined? Was ever the shy maid Economy in such fashion wooed? On all these points they do things better in France. No father should proclaim his son unfit to be trusted with money unless he has had opportunity of learning how to manage an income. Especially with an era of three-party government in view, it should be possible to create in the House a strong non-party movement towards economy, if all but questions of essential policy in the Estimates are left to the free vote of members, on the report of a real Estimates Committee, retaining

[5] Preface to *Parliament and the Taxpayer* (E. H. Davenport).
[6] [illegible]

the good rule that only Government can initiate new expenditures.

It cannot be expected that a party which believes in Government expenditure as a good thing will carry out such a reform; but when the nation is again tired of parasitic Socialism an opportunity will come to the two old parties to lay anew the foundations of prosperity by putting our polity on a coherent basis. That neglected, it may prove too late. For, change as the world may, the Sibyl still conducts her bookselling business on her own primitive rendering of the law of Supply and Demand.

C. Harris.

AFTER HATRY

THE public memory is proverbially short. In the nature of things Clarence Hatry will soon be forgotten, or, worse still, will become a legendary character. The purport of this article is therefore to draw some conclusions from this *cause célèbre* before it is too late. Those of us in the City who are left outside prison walls have not a few lessons to learn from the Hatry case. There are practical reforms which can be made and constructive ideas which can be discussed. There are abuses which can be legislated against by the Stock Exchange as well as by the House of Commons. I do not suggest that it is possible, by parliamentary or financial machinery, to prevent a fool parting with his money, but there are undoubtedly opportunities which can be seized here and now of making the financial world a safer place for the investor.

We must first get our ideas about Clarence Hatry right. I have met people in London who are convinced that he only did what Mr. J. H. Thomas is anxious that all the City fathers should do—finance 'rationalised' industries; that he was a hard-working financier who cared more for success than for money; and that it was his absconding partner, Gialdini, who was the real villain of the piece. On the other hand, I have met an American, still sore from his market losses, who was convinced that Hatry was the cause of the Wall Street crash and could not believe enough bad about him.

I have no doubt that Clarence Hatry was a remarkable man. The common or garden swindler—and there were many promoters of unsound and trumpery companies in the 1928 boom in new issues who were morally, if not legally, swindlers—is content to let his promotions fail and the consequent losses to fall impartially on City houses and the public. He does not indulge in forgery to support the shares of his own companies. He just sneaks quietly away to live in France or South America until the scandal blows over. It was certainly no ordinary swindler who could walk into Sir Gilbert Garnsey's office and declare that certain 'irregularities' had taken place for which he took sole responsibility, and that his companies had failed for about 20,000,000*l*.

But if Clarence Hatry is to be cast in the heroic mould, the maker and loser of millions in the realm of 'high' finance, no one will ever take any steps to prevent the recurrence of his amazing career. And if nothing is done by way of reform it is quite likely that the idea will get abroad that the whole City is a 'ramp' and that Clarence Hatry is only to be distinguished from other rogues in City clothes because he took himself and his promotions so seriously that he forged and swindled to 'make good.'

Let us get down to facts and away from legend. Clarence Hatry and his associates Daniels, Dixon, and Tabor were convicted at the Old Bailey on January 24 after pleading guilty to forgery and uttering and conspiring to defraud. Against his sentence of fourteen years Hatry is appealing on the grounds of severity, and on this, of course, I can make no comment. But certain facts of his career and crime must be kept in mind if we are to draw our conclusions correctly and grasp the lessons to be learned. Hatry first came prominently to the notice of the City after the war as a promoter of company amalgamations. He may be called the apostle of 'rationalisation' in its most irrational form. His ideas of combining companies operating in the same industry may have been theoretically or economically sound, but his financial practices were invariably and fundamentally unsound. Instead of writing useless capital down he wrote it up. He left his amalgamations hopelessly over-capitalised. It must be assumed that his eye was fixed, not on the 'rationalisation' of an industry, not on the more economic and efficient creation of real wealth, but on the promoting profits.

The making of money for money's sake is a common form of madness. If Hatry really believed that he could go on making and cashing in millions out of successful financial promotions in the City, he was doubly insane. Every pound which the promoter puts into his pocket as profit has to be earned somehow by industry or trade. If a company is promoted with a lot of 'watered' capital and its profits do not advance sufficiently to give the 'watered' capital an earnings value, free market dealings on the Stock Exchange will sooner or later bring down the shares of that company to a 'rubbish' price. The promoter may 'cash in' his profits when the company's shares are first introduced to the Stock Exchange, but in the end his sins against economics—that is, his taking of profits which have not been earned—will be found out. So it was with Hatry.

His biggest industrial promotions after the war were British Glass Industries and Jute Industries. The capitalisation of both showed the usual extravagance of Hatry's schemes. British Glass Industries came to a disastrous end in 1924, when its paid-up

capital was written down from 3,639,709*l.* to 914,997*l.* Jute Industries has struggled on under new management, but was compelled in February 1929 to write down its capital by 2,850,000*l.* The Commercial Corporation of London, registered originally in 1920 as the Commercial Bank of London, which Hatry used as the medium for developing his schemes of industrial amalgamations, finally went into liquidation with a loss of over 2,000,000*l.*

Whether Hatry really believed that he could *create* wealth by over-capitalised industrial amalgamations—which is financial jugglery—is a moot point. I think he did. He was not a highly educated man, and it requires a little effort of pure thought to realise the distinction between money and wealth and the way in which wealth can be created or earned. But the financial unsoundness and extravagance of his grandiose promotions, exemplified in the collapse of the Commercial Corporation of London, should have taught the City a lesson—that it was unsafe to follow Hatry or adopt Hatry's propositions.

At this point it is necessary to bring home an unpleasant truth—that if the creditors of the Commercial Corporation of London had recognised that Hatry's methods and schemes were not to be trusted, the second crash which we have just witnessed would never have occurred. Hatry ought never to have been allowed to get again into a position in the City where he could work so much financial havoc. It is not generally known how this happened. In the illuminating story which the *Sunday Express* published on January 26 entitled 'The Road to Ruin by Clarence Hatry,' which was described as 'extracted from the survey of his City activities which he drew up for his legal advisers,' Hatry declared that he proposed to the biggest creditors of the Commercial Corporation that, instead of allowing that company to be compulsorily liquidated, he should form a finance company which should issue to the creditors of the Commercial Corporation income stock certificates entitling the holders to three-quarters of the finance company's profits, the ordinary shares (50,000*l.*) being issued to himself free of cost. He suggested that this finance company should be provided with 100,000*l.* as working capital, and that he should have a salary of 3600*l.* a year and devote his whole time to the business of the company, which was, in effect, to make profits to repay the creditors of the Commercial Corporation. It may seem incredible to us now, with the scenes of the Old Bailey trial in mind, but, according to Hatry, the creditors of the Commercial Corporation, with claims up to 1,400,000*l.* out of a total of 1,500,000*l.*, accepted his scheme. One firm, which was a creditor for about 500,000*l.*, put up the working capital—nearly 100,000*l.*—in the form of a 6 per cent. debenture issue. The finance company was later called Austin Friars Trust.

'If this story of Hatry is true, it is a deplorable business. Suppose a millionaire had had his strong-room broken into by an expert 'cracksman,' who had contrived to get all the millionaire's bonds and valuables out of the country. Suppose the rich man had discovered the burglar and had come to him and said: "You are a very clever financier. You have burgled my house and I have lost 1,400,000*l.* I will not give you over to the police, but I will make you into a company and will finance you with 100,000*l.* working capital. You will obtain the best burglary outfit in the kingdom and the best assistants that money can buy. Go out and break into other people's houses and pay me three-quarters of your profits.'

Now, the creditors of the Commercial Corporation of London had no reason to suspect that Hatry was not a perfectly honest financier. They had no doubt been greatly impressed with the fact that he had thrown in, on his own statement, a personal fortune of 750,000*l.* (and his wife's 70,000*l.*) to support the companies he had promoted, and that he had personally assumed the obligations and assets of the Commercial Corporation of London although he was neither morally nor legally obliged to do so. They were perhaps somewhat mesmerised by his extraordinary self-confidence and had a genuine belief in his capacity to make money. It explains much to find the following passage in Hatry's story in the *Sunday Express* of January 26, which referred to his 'come-back' after the Commercial Corporation smash: 'Such was my optimism and the confidence I had in myself that I believed I could make a new fortune and one of sufficient magnitude to pay off the liabilities I had taken over without relying on any of the securities I had been holding as collateral.' This extraordinary and abnormal self-assurance was no doubt infectious. We will agree that the creditors of the Commercial Corporation must have been impressed with Hatry's capabilities. But they must equally well have known that they were dealing with a species of financial burglar. They had plenty of evidence to show that Hatry was an unsound promoter; that he organised companies characterised by excessive over-capitalisation and invariably doomed to commercial failure; that he contrived to take inordinate profits in the shape of 'watered' capital which he unloaded on the Stock Exchange at inflated prices after 'rigging' a market; and that he would probably go on propounding rash and extravagant schemes in the future as he had done in the past. Knowing the character of his financial business, was it a prudent or social act to set him on his feet again and let him loose among the houses of the City? It is easy, of course, to be wise after the event, but it is obvious that if the creditors of the Commercial Corporation of London had not taken such ...

the [illegible]-Hatry crash would never have occurred. British Glass Industries, Jute Industries, and the Commercial Corporation of London would have been the tombstones, not the milestones, of Hatry's career.

For a time Hatry made money for his creditors. His 'come-back' was apparently a brilliant success. The Austin Friars Trust became the centre of a group of promoting and financing companies. The most dazzling and profitable of its ventures was the promotion of the Drapery and General Investment Trust (later called the Drapery Trust), which was formed to acquire various departmental stores throughout the country. The Drapery Trust made a public issue under the Austin Friars Trust auspices in 1925, and in December 1927 control was sold to Debenhams, Limited. This deal must have brought in enormous profits, if we may judge from Hatry's inflated ideas of market values. Another audacious enterprise was the formation of the Corporation and General Securities, Limited. This company was formed in December 1926 in order to invade the privileged field of home corporation loans. This class of issue was in the hands of three old-established Stock Exchange firms—Nivison & Co., Mullens Marshall & Co. (the Government brokers), and J. and A. Scrimgeour & Co. Mr. Collins, the financial adviser of the home corporations, thought that it was dangerous for these firms to have a monopoly of the corporation issue business, and this view, I believe, was supported by some of the 'big five' joint stock banks. Mr. Collins approached the only man who had nerve to attack the monopoly. To quote Hatry's words from the *Sunday Express*: 'I felt convinced I could succeed although so many others (outside the monopoly) had failed, and I assured Mr. Collins of this.' Hatry did succeed. He made more than twenty home corporation loans. He broke the monopoly by undercutting the rate for commissions and by undertaking to issue the loans at dearer prices. He succeeded, in other words, at the expense of the subscribers to the loans. In this business he was just as lacking in conscience towards the investor, just as prodigal of other people's money, as he was in his over-capitalised industrial promotions. He was true to type as financial burglar.

The Stock Exchange boom in 1928 gave Hatry a further opportunity to continue his industrial promotions through the Austin Friars Trust. The biggest and most impudent of these gambles was the promotion of the Photomaton group of companies to exploit a simple device of automatic photography. The 5s. shares of Photomaton Parent were introduced on the Stock Exchange and in the same year attained a market value of 18s. (When dealings were suspended they were 3s. 9*d*.) The capitalisation of the Photomaton Parent was fantastic. It paid

[illegible],000*l*. in fully paid shares for the world rights [illegible] and America of an automatic photographic machine. It formed 'offspring' companies to acquire its rights in various countries. Its assets were valued at 4,671,000*l*. in a circular which Hatry issued in December 1928 as purporting to come from the directors. Yet it has been estimated that if every man, woman, and child in Great Britain went every year to have their portraits taken by the Photomaton machine the company could not have earned a dividend on its enormous capital. Other financial promotions of Hatry were Retail Trades Securities and Associated Automatic Corporation. The latter was formed in November 1928 to acquire shares in automatic machine manufacturing companies, and its shares, like those of Photomaton Parent, were 'introduced' on the Stock Exchange.

Finally Hatry turned his attention to a bigger field—the iron and steel industry. All the time I imagine he was getting more cocksure, more mesmerised by his success, more blindly confident in his financial 'star.' If to pursue money for money's sake is a form of madness, I feel sure that financiers who think and work in millions acquire a species of that disease called megalomania. Hatry knew nothing about iron and steel. He did not inquire how the iron and steel industry could earn the big promotion profits which he expected to put into his pocket. He just determined to make the 'new fortune,' on which he had set his mind, in a spectacular deal which would be the talk of the City and the 'sensation' of the national Press. In March 1929 the Austin Friars Trust amalgamated certain companies producing cast-iron goods and called the combine Allied Ironfounders. In April came the big coup. Austin Friars Trust offered to purchase for cash the entire issued share capital, debentures, and obligations of United Steel Companies, Limited, and the preference shares of United Strip and Bar Mills, Limited, and to find 1,000,000*l*. of new money. The finances of the plan were hopelessly prodigal—an invariable feature of Hatry's promotions. The terms offered gave the stockholders 20 per cent. more than they could have obtained by selling in the open market. The total cash involved amounted to some 8,000,000*l*. An option was given the stockholders to exchange into a new holding company—Steel Industries of Great Britain (which was to be the nucleus of a 'rationalised' steel industry)—but they wisely and eagerly applied for cash. To meet these cash liabilities Hatry and his associates raised 4,800,000*l*. by pledging the steel shares acquired, but 1,500,000*l*. of this sum was used outside the steel scheme. This was the beginning of his downfall. The misappropriated 1,500,000*l*. was used chiefly in maintaining in a falling market the prices of the shares of the Hatry companies.

It should be appreciated that every pound of the Hatry group's resources was mobilised to pay out the stockholders of the steel companies. The Photomaton, the Retail Trade Securities, and the Associated Automatic shares, of which the Hatry trusts were large holders, were all pledged as collateral for loans, and if their market value depreciated, the lenders, who included some of the 'big five' joint stock banks and some trust and finance houses well known in the City, were bound to demand more cover for their loans. The shares did, of course, depreciate and the lenders did increase their demands for cover. At the same time the stockholders of the steel companies had to be paid out. Hatry saw at once that his great schemes were in jeopardy. An eleventh-hour attempt was made to dispose of his steel purchase, but it failed. Then, as a last resort, he stooped to forgery and swindling to obtain the funds to support the market in his shares and to complete the steel purchase.

The swindling and the forgery were so simple. The Corporation and General Securities had issued loans for Wakefield, Gloucester, and Swindon. The corporation treasurers did not require all their money at once, and did not press the issuing house for payment. Such an accommodating spirit enabled Hatry to convert 322,000*l.* belonging to Wakefield, 250,000*l.* belonging to Gloucester and 250,000*l.* to Swindon to his own uses—a total of 822,000*l.* Next he forged some of their scrip. This was, again, a simple procedure, because he had only to ask the printers who had printed the provisional scrip to print some more—namely, 250,000*l.* for Gloucester, 250,000*l.* for Swindon, and 400,000*l.* for Wakefield. Of course, he asked the firms with whom he deposited this scrip as collateral for further loans not to press for final registration—that is, for definitive certificates signed and sealed at the offices of the corporation treasurers—and only one firm was so ungracious as to do so, which did not matter as long as the others did not press. Hatry raised 795,000*l.* by these forgeries. But stealing even 1,617,000*l.* was insufficient. He raised further sums by duplicating the shares of certain companies which he had promoted and by making out bogus transfers of blocks of shares which he did not possess. This, again, was not difficult, because he controlled a company, Secretarial Services, which acted as registrars for all the Hatry companies. He raised another 700,000*l.* by such irregular dealings in the shares of Drapery Trust and Associated Automatic Machine. That he intended to redeem the forged scrip when his gamble had succeeded was the defence, as Mr. Justice Avory remarked, of any office-boy who robs the till to back a winner. The crime was a very common one, but because it involved millions of money and colossal impudence, because the swindler had been called a financial

genius, the sentimentalists complain that it is a shame to lock him up when he could be employing his brilliant talents in the making of money for the State!

Sir Gilbert Garnsey estimated the total havoc wrought in the crash of Hatry and his group at about 13,750,000*l.* The gross liabilities of the six Hatry finance companies—the Austin Friars Trust, Corporation and General Securities, Dundee Trust, Oak Investment Corporation, Retail Trade Securities, and Aylesbury Trust—were some 29,500,000*l.*, not counting 3,110,000*l.* of share capital. Of that total some 10,000,000*l.* represented inter-company liabilities. Thus there remained about 19,500,000*l.* of outside liabilities, of which 12,550,000*l.* is expected to rank as unsecured, apart from 1,200,000*l.* of the share capital held by the outside public.

The morals of this unique scandal are plain. I would summarise them under four heads—lessons for the banks, for the Stock Exchange, for the municipalities, and for Parliament.

It should be a lesson to the 'big five' banks to reorganise their loans' departments, to attend more to the quality and character of their accounts than to their size, and to collaborate more with one another instead of competing. Four of the 'big five' were involved. Including the bad debts of clients involved in the smash, Barclays confessed to losses which may reach 330,000*l.* and Lloyds to a potential loss of 500,000*l.* No bank can escape losing money from time to time from acts of forgery, but the joint stock banks could have avoided giving Hatry and his companies banking support for his incursion into home corporation issues, which would have saved the unfortunate ratepayers of Wakefield, Gloucester, and Swindon. Without the knowledge that the joint stock banks were supporting him, I doubt whether the treasurers of the corporations would have had any dealings with Hatry. Why were the banks taken in?

Everyone knows that if Hatry had gone to Rothschilds or Barings, or any other of the big private banks in the City, and had asked for a loan on collateral for one of his promotion ventures, he would have been refused. Why? Because the affairs of the private banks are managed by their partners, men of experience and standing in the City, who would have known Hatry for what he was—a speculative promoter with no sound business to his credit. Why, then, was he accepted by four of the 'big five'? Partly because the directors of the joint stock banks do not or cannot give personal attention to the work of the advances department, but leave it to officials who may not have the necessary experience and contacts to judge good form and bad form in the financial world, partly because the competition for accounts between the 'big five' (the only competition which survives in

banking world) is so aware that the character of the account not investigated in the rush to obtain it. It was stated in dence that one of the banks which had acted for the Hatry npanies had had about 100,000,000l. through its hands as a ult of his operations. It is easy to understand why a bank extend far more deference and latitude to an adventurer a big scale than to an ordinary client of unimpeachable racter; but that does not excuse such reprehensible conduct.

But even if the size of Hatry's business rather than its character responsible for the banks' support, nothing can excuse the rt-hearted acquiescence with which some of their advances were ide. For example, according to Sir Gilbert Garnsey's evidence, ctically the whole of the money received by Iron Industries returned at once to Austin Friars Trust. There was no dence of any genuine transactions being carried out by Iron dustries. Yet the total number of shares pledged was 2,190,000 ainst loans of 1,205,000l. The banks who lent money on these ares could never have investigated the industrial standing of n Industries or verified that the company was not performing functions it purported to do.

Moreover, the fact that each of the Hatry finance companies raising loans direct from different banks by the deposit of at seemed to be a sufficient amount of collateral meant that banks were being tricked into providing an inflation of credit the Hatry group. One finance company would obtain a loan the security of shares in a Hatry company and would then oceed to use the loan by buying the shares of another Hatry npany and so raising the market price. Another of the finance mpanies would then proceed to obtain a loan from another nk on the increased market value of these shares. In other ds, the joint stock banks were inflating Hatry's credit without wing it. Surely a little collaboration on the part of the ectors of the banks would have stopped that kind of swindle. deed, collaboration among the officials of the different banks uld probably have exposed the fact that vast sums of money d been raised on duplicated stock. Some defect in organisa-n, some failure in the personnel, some unwillingness to collabo-e, must have been responsible for the banks' losses in the try case. It should not be difficult to put it right.

What are the lessons for the Stock Exchange? It is a quieting fact that the shares of two of Hatry's promotions—otomaton Parent and Retail Trades Securities (the first the st impudent of the lot)—were 'introduced' on the Stock change. This means that the companies concerned had given Stock Exchange Committee as much information as, if not re than, is required under the Companies Act for the issue of a

public prospectus. And yet the Stock Exchange Committee was apparently satisfied with the particulars and did not attempt to exercise its discretionary power to refuse a quotation. It would appear that the Stock Exchange Committee is nervous of using its autocratic powers. The Stock Exchange is a private institution, and it need only give facilities to deal in stocks and shares of approved companies and institutions. It need give no reason for refusing 'leave to deal.' Of course, it is important that the Stock Exchange should be an international market and should provide the widest possible facilities for exchange in securities. But why should it not take action to prevent its machinery from being abused? It must have been obvious that Hatry and his associates had always abused the Stock Exchange facilities. Industrial and trading companies had been promoted, not to develop the wealth of this country, but to afford an opportunity of making profits by share market manipulation. Nor were Hatry and his associates alone in this game. A number of new issuing or promoting houses in the 1928 boom repeated and sometimes excelled Hatry's market performances. It is quite easy for the Stock Exchange to put a stop to this game. It should make it a rule—(1) that vendors' shares shall not be dealt in until a balance sheet and income account have been issued for a year's trading (this suggestion is before the Committee at the present time); (2) that shares of new companies formed to exploit and develop a new patent or process which has not been commercially tried out should not be dealt in until accounts have been issued for a year's operations. These rules would have prevented 'leave to deal' being given to the Photomaton companies and would have thwarted one of Hatry's least deserving gambles.

Sometimes the Stock Exchange Committee has used its powers promptly in defence of the interests of the investor. It refused, for example, to give 'leave to deal' in the case of Totalisators, Limited, because it was not known whether this company's system would be used by the Betting Control Board in Great Britain. Surely it is a short-sighted policy of the Stock Exchange Committee not to use its autocratic powers more often and in a more enlightened manner for the protection of the investor. It does not do nearly as much in this direction as the New York Stock Exchange Committee. To allow dealings to take place in worthless shares which are hoisted by pool operations to extreme and ridiculous heights and are then heavily sold, is to cause grievous losses to fall on the unsuspecting public, with the result that more and more people are driven away from the Stock Exchange. Hundreds of small investors are 'out' of the Stock Exchange to-day for this very reason. If the Stock Exchange had been more jealous of the proper use of its machinery it would

are experiencing such a severe slump in business as it is at the present time.

Next, what lessons are to be learnt on the subject of municipal borrowing? First, it is clear that issues in which public credit is being pledged should be made in a form and manner authorised by the Treasury. The suggestion was made in the Liberal *Yellow Book* that the scope of the Local Loans Fund should be enlarged to cover all borrowing by public authorities. In any case, it seems advisable that the home corporations, even if they are left free to decide the amount of their borrowings, should issue their loans only through the Bank of England, which should advise them on all questions of the time and the terms of issue. Apparently the home corporations had an unofficial adviser in Mr. Collins, who deemed it prudent to get Hatry to break down the monopoly of three Stock Exchange firms. This was, in principle, a right and proper advice, but it was unfortunate that Mr. Collins was not a better judge of Hatry's character. If the Bank of England had been the borough treasurers' adviser it is difficult to believe that Hatry would have been allowed to handle public funds.

In the second place, it was clearly improper to treat Corporation and General Securities as a bank and to leave the ratepayers' money on loan in its hands. One legal opinion has declared that the action of Newcastle Corporation in leaving money on loan to Corporation and General Securities at all was illegal and a breach of trust. It is incredible that any corporation should have thought that one of Hatry's companies, however skilful as an issuing house, was a suitable banker with whom to deposit a large sum of public money. It was the usual practice of the brokers, who had been handling these issues hitherto, to arrange for one of the joint stock banks to handle the physical side of the issue. To treat Corporation and General Securities as issuing house and banker in one showed a laxity of procedure which is deserving of the strongest censure. This matter will no doubt be receiving the attention of the Government.

Finally, there is a lesson for our legislators. One of the evils of the system of 'boom' finance, of which Hatry was not the only exponent in the City, is the interlocking of companies whose balance sheets are designed to conceal their mutual relations. Under this system it is possible to buttress up the credit of A company of the group by B company of the group operating in A's shares on the Stock Exchange. Such methods of finance cannot always be detected or eliminated, but the investor will be better protected if the Companies Act required—(1) a holding company to publish a consolidated balance sheet and income account, bringing into one statement all the assets, liabilities and

earnings of the companies of the group; (2) an interlocking company to publish in its balance sheet details of shares held in other companies of the group; and (3) such particulars to be published also in the prospectuses of any holding or interlocking company. The new Companies Act, which came into force on November 1 last year, undoubtedly tightened up the system of company finance and introduced a number of important reforms, but unfortunately it failed to require a holding company to publish a consolidated balance sheet and income account or an interlocking company to publish details of its holdings. It is, of course, impossible to legislate the unscrupulous promoter out of the City, but his operations would be rendered less easy if an amendment to remedy this defect of the Companies Act were brought on the Statute-book.

It is well to repeat, in conclusion, that no power on earth—not even the hidden powers of the joint stock banks and the Stock Exchange Committee—can protect the investing public completely against its own speculative instincts or stupidity or against fraud. Indeed, it would be one of the greatest misfortunes of the Hatry case—worse than all the losses so far recorded—if the speculative instinct were to be killed. If nothing but Government and other trustee securities were to find a market on the Stock Exchange national stagnation would be complete, and not even Lord Beaverbrook's new party could bring business back to life. It is essential for investors to take risks and for promoters to show enterprise, but we do not want the 'boom' type of finance which Hatry and his kind created for a world bereft of its financial senses. It should not be left to financiers of the burglar type to amalgamate companies in the drapery business or to develop a new patent or to attempt to rationalise the iron and steel industry.

Fortunately there are signs of a change. The Bank of England has even called in economists to advise it upon trade affairs with a view to its participation in industrial reconstructions. This I take to be a call to the great private banks and finance houses in the City to show a little less conservatism and a little more enterprise—a change which would surely put an end to 'Hatrified' finance.

E. H. Davenport.

CHARING CROSS BRIDGE

It is in the nature of a tragedy that when the time has come for the greatest reconstruction of London since the time of the Great Fire, when there seems to be an opportunity of putting into practice the dreams of artists and reformers of the past half-century, the decision as to the actual carrying out of the proposal is so prejudiced as to prevent any adequate discussion of the merits or demerits of the scheme and of its effects upon London as a whole.

A bridge at Charing Cross for the double purpose of creating a new traffic artery and for making possible the development of the Surrey side of the River Thames has been the ideal of most people taking a keen interest in London as London, and of artists who have portrayed a south-side Embankment reaching, in the minds of some of them, from the Tower to Battersea Park.

The London Society has done good work by bringing together on two occasions in public exhibition a large number of the designs which have been prepared in connexion with the bridge and of Thames-side development. Some of these were flamboyant, some possibly impracticable, some obviously too expensive to be thought of in a workaday world; but all of them had vision—all had a definite purpose in view and were designed to serve the public good.

It is little less than disastrous that the Charing Cross Bridge proposal of the London County Council seems to fit into none of the desirable categories. There is no consideration of beauty, although we are promised that when the bones of the carcase are all definitely fixed the architects shall come in and be allowed to suggest how they should be dressed. There is no proper consideration of traffic, and no single voice has been raised in support of the nightmare proposals which will precipitate the concentrated burden of the streets into one of those parts of London least able effectively to receive it. Town-planning considerations are not only ignored, but are flouted: undesirable *culs de sac* are formed, some roads are covered in for a length of over 400 feet, the resultant tunnels being only 17 feet and in one case only 15 feet high. The actual road distance from the Embankment to the

bridge where the river is some 1200 yards, in conse the circuitous route to be followed by way of Northum Avenue and the Strand; and the prospect of develop the Surrey side is put back for generations, if it is not, fatally blocked.

There is no part of London more depressing than facing Charing Cross across the river, and this fact is entirely due to the network of railways, which has through traffic routes and stultified development. A g the map vividly illustrates how South London has had for the railway lines running through it, and for the viadu embankments which were formed in the 'fifties and the The new proposals add to this gloomy prospect yet ne rail and road embankments to a length of nearly 1400 ya provide nearly 400 yards of tunnel over that very stretch where a century ago

> silent, bare,
> Ships, towers, domes, theatres, and temples lie
> Open unto the fields, and to the sky.

A properly conceived bridge and roadway, with thor which should open up this hinterland and an embank built as to encourage ambitious architecture behind it transform the area, which, after all, is geographically as the middle of London as is the Strand, and is the centr biggest population in London. Not only does the new b to do this, but over a considerable proportion of the ar make the task difficult for many years to come.

Another point of municipal economics which seems t sight of is that of the destruction of land values. The ments and bridges which have followed upon railway ment on the south side have sterilised whole districts, an connexion with these, and not in some of the older London, that we find the worst slums and blind alle which the housing reformer of the future will have to de conception of the bridge is parochial in the extreme. and it ends. As to where the traffic is coming from, or is going to, apparently nobody knows and nobody cares. not a matter affecting merely Lambeth and Westmins a matter affecting merely London itself. The whole pr the traffic of the home counties ought to be brought int when so great a question is being dealt with. It is e than a town-planning matter; it is a regional plannin and it would be interesting to know whether the view supreme town-planning authority have been considered. built-up area of London, of course, at present no town- authority exists. But have the Ministry of Health

sulted? We know there is the Greater London Regional Planning Committee, who take within their purview an area with a diameter of 25 miles from Charing Cross. This advisory body, called into existence to encourage and to co-ordinate the town-planning of the home counties, does represent the whole of the 140 local authorities within the area. It is able to formulate a detached view of the problem and to bring to bear upon it the experience of each district. Besides the advice of the local officials, the Regional Committee is advised by its own town-planner, who is one of the most famous of his generation, and this influential body has expressed the opinion that the bridge as planned is a mistake.

Not only is there the north and south through traffic to be considered, but there is a further point not often realised—that together with this bridge there should be considered also a means of facilitating traffic between Westminster and the City and so of relieving the Strand, a much longer route. The sweep of the Thames at this point, which inspired Wordsworth a century and a quarter ago, still awaits adequate treatment. It does not need a master mind to picture that bend clothed with architectural dignity, bordered by a noble embankment and opening on to a replanned South London, where the recoupment value would make the cost look trivial.

The number of millions of pounds which would have to be spent on the scheme is not really very important. Chicago, despite its reported financial position, is spending hundreds of millions at the present time on improvement schemes; New York and Paris have programmes on foot that dwarf the figures which look so formidable here. What really matters is, What is to be secured for the money? And in this connexion the expenditure of 15,000,000*l*. may be much less economical than Chicago's 300,000,000*l*., because instead of creating value values are being destroyed. Coutts's Bank, Gatti's Restaurant, the Old Vic, all go without compensating advantages. These things represent money. Their destruction would not matter so much if something better were put in their places, but the most careful consideration on every side of the official proposal fails to reveal the provision of a single noble building plot on which recoupment can be earned. The site dictated by the railway company on the river frontage is the one potentially valuable piece of land, and that will not be available for commercial purposes. As already stated, hundreds of yards of roads, meaning double that amount of frontage, will be in tunnel, and not only is there no recoupment value created, but the existing values will be lost. The roads leading to the station are on an embankment or on steep gradients, and there is no recoupment

value there. The gaunt, blank walls which are going to add to the tragedy of South London seem to have only one potential value, a huge bill-posting station. Villiers Street and Buckingham Street will go; their values will be lost. Belvedere Road becomes a nightmare. Both ends are blocked, and to get to the new levels it will be necessary to climb three flights of stair at one end and two flights at the other. What future can there be for such a *cul de sac* in such surroundings—entered at one side only and dominated by the mass of road and railway embankment? And it was in 1803 that Wordsworth sang 'Earth has not anything to show more fair.'

This degrading of the district is due entirely to the position of the railway station. In their first report the engineers consulted recommended that the transferred Charing Cross should be beside Waterloo Station, and there does not seem to be any other opinion among those who have been consulted. For the convenience of passengers, access to the tubes passing under the Thames, consolidation of traffic, ridding the area of embankments and the hindrance of railway lines, opening up the south side for through traffic, preserving to London its long withheld heritage of a Surrey-side embankment, everybody has envisaged this site. Now the railway company comes along, and not only ignores the considered opinion of two generations, but is able to override the technical advisers of the London County Council and of the Ministry of Transport, and to persuade that somewhat masterful person, the Minister himself, that the autocratic demands of this concern are more important than the well-being of a big tract of London.

In the mile and a quarter of distance between ground level on the one side of the new bridge and the ground level on the other almost every architectural, town-planning, and economic consideration seems to have been ignored. This part of London, which offers the most beautiful views of the City, so near to some of the best buildings that we have, demands dignity, composition, the most careful planning: as dictated by the railway company, the opposite effect is inevitable. The whole thing fails when analysed from the point of view of treatment. The angles of roads, their direction and shape, their junctions; the meaningless bits of land that are left; the maddening truncated westward spur on the north side, all make one wonder why this scheme was ever promulgated. Possibly it is the result of a mind that has grown up with an idea that the present ugly railway bridge at Charing Cross would persist and that a high level bridge was necessary to carry road traffic above it. The designers seem to have lost sight of the fact that that railway bridge is to be done away with, and that what they are really concerned with is the

provision of a means for crossing the river. All the curves and ramps, the steep gradients, the precipitation of traffic into one of the most crowded quarters of the world—all of these would have been avoided if the simple question of crossing the river had been adequately considered. Traffic could be collected and distributed in half a dozen different streams on either side if advantage had only been taken of existing thoroughfares. One half of the cost would be saved and the irreparable injury which is threatened would not have menaced London. After the Great Fire Wren, Evelyn, and others prepared plans for a future London of beauty and of vision. None of these plans was carried out. There is an urgent need to-day for a new plan of London and a scheme and time-table of development. The first thing to be done is for a survey to be made and a plan prepared. 'Improvement schemes' come and go—here a little and there a little; each one considered by itself; each one carried out without regard to another. There is no co-ordination; there seems to be no vision. With a survey of London's needs, with a plan showing their co-ordination, with a programme emphasising their relative importance, the colossal blunder of the official plan of Charing Cross could never have been perpetrated. These things still require to be done, and one of the greatest benefits that could be conferred upon succeeding generations would be the preparation of such a programme in our time.

Out of all this turmoil over the bridge may yet emerge good if attention can be focussed upon this very simple, but very much neglected, expedient of bringing order and method into our dealings with municipal matters. The ground has already been broken and the war-time work of the R.I.B.A. Committee is on record. The cost would be trifling compared with the lasting benefits to be secured, and it would appear to be essentially a matter which would command the support of all citizens of good will.

EWART G. CULPIN.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN ROUMANIA

. NEW chapter in the political history of Roumania was opened vhen, in the autumn of 1928, the National-Peasant Party, under he leadership of Dr. Juliu Maniu, came into power. The event 'as hailed by the Press of Great Britain and of other Western tates as a triumph of democracy. An early reorientation of .oumanian policy towards Western forms was forecast, and rapid improvement in Roumania's economic situation was rophesied. The downfall of the Bratianu *régime* was greeted the end of an autocracy and the guarantee of an imminent -Balkanisation of Roumania.

To-day, some eighteen months later, the National-Peasant arty are still in power. To what extent have the confident nticipations of the foreign Press been realised? What is the al significance of the advent of the Maniu Government? What the political situation in Roumania to-day? Before attempting answer these questions a warning must be uttered to those who e interested in Roumanian affairs. Information concerning .oumania appearing in the Press must be treated with great aution. Some of the news which filters through is specially ispired for export purposes only, and some of it is mutilated in ansit. Moreover, even direct quotations from Roumanian wspapers are apt to be misleading, inasmuch as liberal Press ws have given rise to a free exploitation of journalistic sensa-onalism. It should be added, however, as a tribute to Rou-iania's sense of political æsthetics, that her foreign propaganda rvice is on a much smaller scale, and perhaps less mendacious, ian that of several of her neighbours.

The growth of the National-Peasant Party was the inevitable esult of two revolutionary changes in modern Roumanian history -namely, the expropriation of the large estates, and the great cessions to Roumanian territory which occurred after the war. r. Maniu's party seeks to express the two new needs which arose -that of representing the newly-created peasant proprietor, and at of consolidating the new provinces and the Old Kingdom to a unified State. In certain respects the National-Peasant arty of Roumania may be compared with the British Labour

Party. Both came into being as a result of a change in social stratification, and both have risen to power with extraordinary rapidity. Here, however, the parallel ends, and it is a mistake to suppose, as certain members of the British Labour Party have supposed, that a Government elected by a peasant proletariat bears any close kinship to one representing industrial workers. Socialism, indeed, is almost non-existent in Roumania.

Now, if the rise of the National-Peasant Party may be readily explained on historical grounds, its final success in 1928 depended in a large measure on fortuitous causes. In fact, from the standpoint of constitutional politics, the most interesting aspect of the Maniu Government is the manner in which it came into office. The two most potent of the immediate causes leading to the victory of the National-Peasant Party were the deaths in 1927, in rapid succession, of King Ferdinand and of Ionel Bratianu. To understand this rightly a brief review must be made of the structure of the Roumanian political system.

In theory that system is no less elaborate and complex than that of the Western States upon which it was too hastily modelled. Except that the head of the State has the power to summon and dismiss his Prime Ministers irrespective of parliamentary majorities, the Roumanian constitution is conceived on the broadest democratic lines. In practice, however, the system depends for its satisfactory working upon three conditions—namely, a judicious evasion of constitutional rules, a sagacious King, and a firm Prime Minister. The constitution is unworkable in practice because of the illiteracy of the peasants and the lack of political horse-sense among the educated classes. These ills are remediable; the one may be cured in a generation, and the other so soon as Roumania is allowed to develop herself in tranquillity and without the volcanic disturbances (not of her seeking) which have characterised her history. It is, perhaps, already a sign of incipient political wisdom that the Roumanian people accept without any sophistical protest the violation in practice of a constitution which only academic myopia or a youthful tendency to imitation could have created. Those foreign observers who focus their attention upon the corrupt aspects of Roumanian public life do little credit to their powers of understanding; they should remember the long and painful method of trial and error whereby sanctions have been invented in their own countries to prevent some of the more glaring manifestations of human peccability.

During the post-war period up to 1927 Roumania was ruled by two men—King Ferdinand and Ionel Bratianu. It is true that Bratianu was not in power during the whole of that period, but the brief intervals during which he was out of office were deter-

mined by himself and cannot be considered as political defeats. Ionel Bratianu, a man without rival in the personal political power which he wielded, systematically 'made' the elections whenever called upon by the King to form a Ministry. Moreover, it was to him that the King invariably turned when the other Administrations had shown their incompetence. It is probable, therefore, that, had the Ferdinand-Bratianu combination endured, the National-Peasant Party would not have had their opportunity as early as in 1928. But the hour of the Liberals' first real downfall was struck when King Ferdinand died, leaving in his place a regency; it was confirmed when, a few months later, Ionel Bratianu died too, leaving as his successor his able but far less forceful brother, Vintila.

In due course the regency decided that the Liberal *régime* should be exchanged for a National-Peasant Government. To-day Roumania is ruled, not by the two strong personal forces which her political development demands—a King and a powerful Prime Minister—but by a Regency Council, and a politician who, although the leader of the most progressive element in Roumania to-day, has never attempted nor desired to emulate the autocratic proclivities of Ionel Bratianu.

Let us examine in turn the present positions of the regency and of the National-Peasant Government. In the realm of constitutional history the question of the regency is the most troublesome of Roumania's unsolved problems. Never a satisfactory way out of the difficulty created by Prince Carol's exile, it is becoming increasingly manifest that the Regency Council is not capable of fulfilling the functions which it was destined to perform. The present Regency Council suffers from two serious defects—first, being tricephelous, it is acephelous; secondly, none of its three members has had any adequate training in the difficult art of government. Neither of these defects will be easy to remedy, for there does not appear to be in Roumania at present any outstanding personality whose impartiality would inspire confidence among all sections of the community.

Until recently the Regency Council consisted of Prince Nicholas (King Ferdinand's second son), the Roumanian Patriarch Miron, and M. Buzdugan. Prince Nicholas may be supposed to be influenced by his strong-charactered mother, Queen Marie, but his youth and inexperience are obvious handicaps. Moreover, he has found it difficult to achieve that measure of personal popularity which is indispensable to the prestige of a dynasty. He may be looked upon, however, as the most permanent member of the Regency Council, for it is unlikely that Queen Marie would permit him to resign, thereby losing some of her power over the Council. The patriarch's position as head of the Roumanian

Orthodox Church makes it somewhat embarrassing for him to discharge temporal functions which might not be universally approved. Furthermore, the declarations of high ecclesiasts do not carry the same weight in Roumania as in many other countries. The Church has never been considered a career for the sons of the rich and educated classes: it has not, therefore, been able to establish any very strong hold over the minds of the people. M. Buzdugan was the strongest of the three regents. What he lacked in political experience he made up by his dignified personality. It is said that it was he who was chiefly instrumental in bringing the National-Peasant Party into power.

M. Buzdugan's death a short time ago caused a constitutional crisis which is liable to be repeated at any time. No clear provisions had been made for the appointment of his successor. The Government claimed the right to fill the vacancy. Their opponents declared that this would be unconstitutional. After some heated negotiations, in the course of which, unfortunately, Queen Marie was concerned, the Government nominee, M. Saratzeanu, was appointed. Like M. Buzdugan, the new regent is a jurist by profession. It cannot be denied that the Regency Council, never very strong, is weaker to-day than it has ever been before.

How is Roumania likely to solve the problem of the weakness of the ultimate source of executive power in the State? A prominent ex-Liberal Minister has told me that, in his view, it would have been far better for Roumania if the Regency Council had never been brought into existence. Instead, a foreign dynasty should have been imported. Such a step would have secured general approbation, since a foreign head of the State would not have been subject to the influences of importunate office-seeking friends. Naturally, for good or for ill, the days for such heroic remedies are now past. There are three other possible lines of development. In the first place, an opportunity may present itself in due course for the replacement of one or two of the present regents. But, as I have already said, apart from party politicians, Roumania is suffering at present from a dearth of public men of sufficient eminence and prestige. The few names which suggest themselves are none of them entirely suitable. Queen Marie, perhaps the most dynamic personality in Roumania to-day, is handicapped by her sex; in any case, her direct influence over the conduct of the affairs of the State might damage the reputation of the dynasty for impartiality. Professor Iorga, General Averescu, and M. Lupu have all lost ground with the decline in the fortunes of their little parties. M. Titulescu, the most brilliant Roumanian of to-day, appears to show no inclination to leave London and Geneva.

Secondly, the Government may gradually come to increase its constitutional powers. The appointment of M. Saratzeanu was an indication of this tendency. On the other hand, it is pretty certain that, if the present Government were to proceed too far in this direction, the Liberals would immediately exercise all the powerful influences which they still possess to prevent such a development. Finally, there is the possibility of the return of Prince Carol. It is not necessary to recall here the domestic incidents which led to the heir-apparent's exile and to the renunciation of his rights to the throne in favour of his infant son, now King Mihai I. Nor would it be safe to predict what would happen if, when the ban automatically expires in a few years' time, Prince Carol were to return to his country. All that need be said is that the wildest rumours have been circulating in Roumania recently concerning Prince Carol's imminent return. In certain circumstances it does not seem impossible that, if this were to materialise, Prince Carol would be joyfully acclaimed by the peasants and supported by the army. A *coup d'état*, however, must not be expected, for, whereas the army is undoubtedly predominantly Liberal in sentiment, the Liberal Party does not desire Prince Carol's return. Moreover, a new factor has arisen (reminiscent of the Sokols in Jugoslavia) in the Government's organisation of 'Voinici.' On the whole, therefore, both Government and Opposition may be relied upon to act with extreme discretion. There is no fear of public order being jeopardised: indeed, there are few populations in Europe to-day so opposed to manifestations of physical force as the Roumanian peasantry. The fact that the figure of Prince Carol has again risen on the Roumanian political horizon is significant chiefly as a sign of the unsatisfactory position of the Regency Council. One may conclude, on the whole, that the wisest solution of the regency problem would be to appoint in due course as one of the members of the Council a certain member of the present Cabinet whose name was mentioned when the last vacancy occurred, and who, previous to 1928, had kept himself aloof from party politics.

I turn now to examine the other dominant factor in Roumanian public life to-day—the National-Peasant Government. Dr. Maniu's Administration is more than a party Government. The National-Peasant Party represents the second stage of the movement for the emancipation of the peasant which began when the large landed proprietors grudgingly ceded their estates to the State for distribution among the peasants. Unfortunately, this second stage, that of giving to the peasant the status of economic and political manhood, should have been made a third stage. The second stage should have been the education of the peasantry. Nevertheless, in spite of a certain chronological anomaly, the

Government now in power in Roumania represents a force which has become an integral part of the social and political structure of the country. The *raison d'être* of the National-Peasant Party will disappear, however, if there is any failure to educate the peasant to an understanding of his new civic responsibilities.

What of the present and the immediate future? The plain fact is that after eighteen months of National-Peasant rule Roumania is still in a distressing economic situation. In spite of the foreign loan, negotiations for which were initiated by the Liberals, the greatest need of Roumania to-day is capital. Without money she cannot exploit her immensely rich natural resources or rationalise her principal industry—agriculture. This is not the place to discuss why Roumania fails to attract sufficient foreign capital for her requirements. Doubtless a certain instability of legislation during the past few years has been a factor in causing foreign investors to fight shy of Roumanian enterprises. On the other hand, investors have themselves been guilty of an astonishing lack of initiative. The sense of political security which foreign capital demands was never so strong in Roumania as it is to-day. Yet even if the necessary capital cannot be found abroad, it may not be impossible for certain internal measures to be taken which would improve the economic situation. The economies which Dr. Maniu set out to establish might be pushed even further; and a campaign might be instituted with the object of inculcating habits of saving among the wealthier classes of a people whom a checkered history has rendered notoriously extravagant and improvident.

Public dissatisfaction with the economic position of the country has been fanned by the considerable increase in taxation which the Government have been compelled to impose in order to enable them to carry out the reforms on their programme. The Liberals have been the first to profit by the impotence of the Government—a situation which is probably due rather to a decade of Liberal sins of omission than to a year of National-Peasant sins of commission. They declare with the utmost confidence not only that they are ready to take up the reins of office again, but that the Maniu Government shall remain in office only so long as they desire. Their policy at present is to allow the Government to involve itself still more inextricably in the tangle which it is creating and then to compel the regency to dismiss them. Events may prove, of course, that this Liberal optimism is justified. At the moment, however, it is merely a return to the traditional Liberal attitude of looking upon all Governments save their own as essentially transitional between two terms of Liberal administration. This, I think, is now a fundamentally unsound attitude,

for even if the National-Peasant Government were to be overthrown in the near future, they would consitute a formidable Opposition and would in due course return to power. Moreover it is by no means so certain as the Liberals declare that an imminent change of Government will take place, except in the unlikely event of a Liberal *coup d'état*. In the first place, no party is anxious to conduct a winter election campaign in a country where communications are impeded by the snow. Secondly, if the regency dismissed the present Government, it would lose nearly all its remaining prestige in the event of the National-Peasant Party being returned again by the country. This is a risk which the Liberals cannot afford to run, for it would strengthen the demand for the return of Prince Carol. Thirdly, the peasants, having once tasted free elections, are not likely to submit passively to any organised bullying at the hands of the Liberals. Fourthly, the peasant has had a good crop, and may not be so vociferously discontented with the new *régime* as are the overtaxed town bourgeoisie and the Liberal upper classes. On the other hand, even the peasant no longer displays any great enthusiasm for his new masters. The crowds of peasants who flocked about the entrances of the Ministries a year ago with a delightful air of childish importance are no longer to be seen. Even the popular Minister Mihalache, who never appears in anything but peasant costume, has lost his little throng of admirers. The great peasant demonstration which the Government organised in Bucharest last November passed through the streets with depressing sobriety, thinking only of the 100 lei (half a crown) which each of them was to receive in addition to free railway transport.

It is in the realm of foreign affairs that the National-Peasant Government has been most conspicuously successful. Under the guidance of M. Mironescu the Roumanian Foreign Office has succeeded in establishing better relations with other countries than have ever existed before. The prestige of Roumania abroad to-day stands higher than ever. This is no small achievement for the Foreign Minister of a country which during the last few years has been systematically attacked by one of the most highly organised and expensive propaganda services in Europe. When Roumania's political alliance with Jugoslavia and Czecho-Slovakia becomes an economic reality, and when this co-operation among the Danubian States is extended so as to include Hungary (not an unlikely development since the Hague settlements), a new era of prosperity may be inaugurated in Central and South-Eastern Europe.

A last word. There has recently been formed in Roumania a Feminist Party whose up-to-dateness should be the envy of the

older feminine organizations of the West. The talent of Roumanian women diplomats is already well known. Let us now watch with interest the achievements of Roumanian women in home politics, and, if necessary, let us not be ashamed to learn any lessons which they may have to teach!

F. CHALMERS WRIGHT.

THE NEW ROMAN INDEX

There are few bodies which know so little of their own past, beyond those particular things which it is convenient they should know, as the Roman Catholics. And nothing is so directly responsible for this ignorance as the system of censorship, culminating in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. The emperor Augustus, so Tacitus tells us, was the first in Rome to legislate against written or spoken words, as apart from deeds. This may not mean all that it seems to mean at first sight; unpopular talk was doubtless often punished by the populace without formal law. But at least it indicated, roughly, a universal tendency in politics. A Government strong in its appeal to human nature and common sense can afford to grant much licence of speech; a Government uncertain in its foundations must be severe on that point, sometimes even to ferocity. And the governmental foundation may be shaky not only in itself, but relatively; there may be quite enough popular consent to support any ordinary authority, but dictatorial rule throws far more burden and stress upon such general consent, and must therefore rely proportionately upon artificial supports. The Roman Emperors naturally committed themselves to this policy of censorship. The Christian Church, though it had not altogether waited until the State took it into partnership, inevitably became less tolerant of free speech in proportion as it imitated the Imperial organisation, and was able to appeal for support to the secular arm. In process of time, therefore, when the popes had advanced their claim to wield both swords, and had organised in the Inquisition a most elaborate machinery of repression, it became as dangerous for a man to speak freely his fullest thoughts as it is now, if report be true, in Moscow.

The stages of this natural progress are fairly simple. Gelasius I., in 494 and 496, was the first pope who can be said to have drawn up an Index of prohibited books; his second decree was later incorporated in the *Corpus of Canon Law*. Gradually, after the barbarian invasions, when intellectual life revived, and heresies gained force, prohibitions multiplied. The Bible, especially, was fenced round; and, though no pope promulgated

any explicit and universal decree forbidding its study by the common people, yet vernacular versions were so little encouraged at best, and so strictly condemned at the worst, that even Sir Thomas More, in that *Apology* against Tyndale, in which he does all he can to justify this negative policy, confesses sadly that the positive side was being neglected, and that religion suffered from the lack of some authorised version which might take the place of the condemned Wycliffite Bible.

University lectures had often been strictly censored in the Middle Ages. When, quite recently, Leo XIII. suspected Monseigneur d'Hulst of teaching a philosophy other than that of Aquinas at the Institut Catholique of Paris, and when the Pope compelled the Monseigneur to go all the way to Rome and produce the actual manuscript of his lectures in exculpation, he was simply following mediæval methods.[1] Moreover, so long as the Church could call upon the secular arm for support, the directest methods were employed. As the *Catholic Encyclopædia* puts it, in its article on 'Censorship,' 'down to more recent times, forbidden books were got out of the way in the simplest manner, by destroying or confiscating them.' Gregory IX., St. Francis's friend, ordered in 1239 the burning of all copies of the *Talmud*. He sent letters round to the kings and archbishops of France, England, Spain and Portugal; but apparently France alone obeyed. There were similar holocausts by order of Innocent IV. (1244), St. Louis (1254), Clement IV. (1267), Benedict XII. (1415), the Roman Inquisition (1555), and three succeeding popes. The Jewish religion was, in certain senses, tolerated; but it seemed too much that Jews should be allowed to possess directly anti-Christian books. The Council of Trent permitted them to survive only under strict expurgation. Such destruction did, indeed, prove impossible in the complete sense in which more than one of the popes had commanded it; copies were hidden at whatever risk, and became the parents of later copies. Even when this destructive policy was tried within the Franciscan Order, with far less excuse, it just failed of finality. The majority of the Order, especially after the saint's death, had trended in certain directions, contrary not only to the spirit, but even to the letter, of the saint's rule. There were biographies and early memorials which, to any reader of the later thirteenth century, marked a striking contrast between the then friar and the earliest Franciscan brethren. Those documents, naturally, were appealed to by the small minority who cherished—and no doubt exaggerated in the heat of conflict—the simplicity and unworldliness of the earliest ideal. After serious quarrels, St. Bonaventura was elected Minister-General of the Order, as a strong and wise man

[1] *Life of Leo XIII.*, by Julien de Narfon (London, 1911, p. 201).

not too definitely committed to either party. He thus wrote, soon after 1260, an 'official' biography, in which the difficulties were naturally glossed over as much as possible. Then the General Chapter of 1266, under his presidency, decreed 'that all legends of St. Francis hitherto written be destroyed,' in favour of the new official *Life*. This decree was so far successful that the earliest and most valuable Franciscan records disappeared almost entirely. Of Celano's first *Life of St. Francis*, written at the command of that pope who had been his intimate friend, only twelve copies are known to have survived the Middle Ages. His second *Life*, almost equally official in its own day, exists in only two manuscripts; and his *Treatise on the Miracles* was discovered in a mutilated copy only the other day. We have some indications that this oblivion had overtaken them already in the later Middle Ages. Yet without them our idea of the real St. Francis, and of his earliest disciples' actual doings and thoughts, would have been diametrically opposite, on certain important points, from that which we gather from those all-but-destroyed early and authentic records. We shall never know how much of our ignorance of the Middle Ages is due to the deliberate destruction of inconvenient evidence.

But with the invention of printing destruction became more difficult. That kind of university censorship which we have seen Leo XIII. renewing was becoming insufficient then as it is insufficient now; the written and printed word began hopelessly to overflow the spoken word, and the new problem called for new methods. It is significant that systematic censorship after the modern pattern did not begin with Rome. The city of Rome had no theological school worth speaking of in the Middle Ages, and comparatively few books were printed there. The birthplace and busiest focus of printing was on the Middle and Lower Rhine; and the first beginning of modern censorship was at Cologne. There, in 1479, the Pope granted plenary powers to the authorities, while praising their past zeal in checking the printing or sale of irreligious books. Then, in 1487, a bull of Innocent VIII. prescribed a universal censorship for the while Western Church—a censorship which each bishop was bidden to exercise within his own diocese. But here, as 250 years earlier, it was found that episcopal initiative, and even episcopal obedience, left much to be desired. As, therefore, in 1231 the bishops' too untrustworthy action against heresy was superseded by the Papal Inquisition, so in 1542 this same Inquisition was entrusted with the main responsibility for censorship of books. In 1559, for the first time, an official list of prohibited books for the whole world was printed in Rome. It has since passed through about a hundred editions and many forms; and here, at the end of 1929, we have the

latest, furnished with every official guarantee. The preface, by a significant innovation, is now in vernacular Italian; and it will doubtless be translated officially into other tongues.

Hell, writes the Cardinal Secretary in his very first sentence, is now stirring against the Church a far more terrible battle than those of the earlier centuries, when martyrs sealed their faith with their blood. For 'the evil press'—*la stampa cattiva*—is a more perilous weapon than the sword. St. Paul, as we know, set the example of censorship; he caused evil books to be burned (Acts xix. 19). St. Peter's successors have always followed this example; nor could they have done otherwise, for their Church, Infallible Mistress and sure guide of the Faithful, is bound in conscience to keep the press pure. Free-will is one of God's greatest gifts to man; but it degenerates into libertinage in those men who are 'infected with that moral plague which goes by the name of "Liberalism."' Civil Governments have employed preventive censure, especially in recent times, 'with a rigour unknown to the Church'—an allusion, apparently, to the Soviet *régime*. Men have so misunderstood the Bible that 'popes and councils have more than once found themselves constrained to regulate, and even sometimes to prevent, the divulgation of the Scriptures in living languages.' On this point, however, she has been cruelly maligned; 'it would not be just to say that the Church has absolutely forbidden the Bible in the vulgar tongue; it is enough to recall the fact that, in the seventy years between the invention of printing and the publication of Luther's German version, more than 200 editions of the Scriptures, in various current languages, duly approved by the Church, were disseminated among the peoples.'

But what authority can possibly be quoted for these '200 editions'? There were, I believe, only twenty-one editions of the vernacular Bible in all Europe before Luther's: fourteen German, four Dutch, two Italian, and one French. We could, indeed, get up to 200 or thereabouts by counting every edition of the Psalter alone, or of the little volume containing just the Gospels and Epistles for Mass; but what responsible person can maintain that such a volume constitutes an 'edition of Scripture,' or, as the meaning of *Scrittura* would be more exactly conveyed in English, 'of the Scriptures'? In that sense we carry two editions of the Scripture in one hand whenever we take a prayer-book to church. It seems incredible that a statement so deceptive, if not so patently false, can be made in this solemn official publication, under the authority of a pope whose main pre-papal distinction was the librarianship of a great library, and whose suspicions as a bibliographer ought at once to have been aroused. Moreover, the second statement is worse than deceptive—it is categorically false; and, here again,

It is a simple matter of bibliography. Not one of these twenty-one Bibles, I believe, bears the least mark of official approbation; on the contrary, we have every reason to believe that they were more or less contraband. For instance, a Latin Bible printed at Cologne in 1479 bears the approval of the university censor; a Dutch Bible printed there in 1480 bears no such token. No Roman Catholic critic, I believe, has ever ventured to impugn Miss Deanesly's verdict that 'the printing of German Bibles was done without the approval of the Church.'[1] Unless Cardinal Merry del Val is ready to produce hitherto unsuspected evidence, it would seem that we have here one of the most striking examples of the falsehoods naturally generated by a system which struggles so consistently to shelter itself from healthy open criticism.

The comic side of the Index (for censorship is a tragi-comedy) is brought out more directly in an article of the *Quarterly Review* for October 1902, and indirectly by J. Mendham's *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*, which is still valuable after 100 years, and can often be picked up for a few shillings. It comes out also in G. H. Putnam's solid *Censorship of the Church of Rome* (two vols., 1906) and, though less obtrusively, in the monumental *Index der Verbotenen Bücher* of Professor Reusch, one of the great German scholars who declined to accept the Infallibility Decree of 1870. One of the most interesting studies is that of comparing the books pilloried with the books that have been spared, or, again, of following a condemned book until it is let loose again. Montaigne's essays have been forbidden to the faithful for centuries, and are forbidden still. That this is not a question of morals, but of dogma, is shown by the case of Rabelais, who was proscribed in 1559, but is now let loose upon the public. So is Boccaccio, though the early censors were troubled about him, especially at the Council of Trent. One of the shifts adopted was to publish an ecclesiastically authorised edition in which all the piquant indecencies remained, but the actors were transformed from priests and friars into lawyers and other laymen; a copy of this may easily be consulted at the British Museum, in which all the changes are carefully noted in ink. It may be pleaded that these authors are sufficiently forbidden by the general prohibition against immoral writings, but in that case, why specify names at all in this random fashion? Balzac, who at one time was condemned *en bloc*, is now forbidden only where his novels treat of love: *omnes fabulæ amatoriæ*—a phrase which is applied to George Sand also. Certain earlier absurdities have certainly disappeared from this Index of 1929. We no longer find booksellers pilloried by mistake as authors, or whole lists taken at random from German Protestant booksellers' catalogues and mutilated by Italian printers; nor, again,

[1] *The Lollard Bible* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1920, p. 130).

is it now sinful to read the two orthodox bishops Gritius and Macer, who had combated Luther and had thus been mistaken for Lutherans by the random inquisitors who helped Paul IV. to draw up his Index. Several time-honoured names have been released also, as we have seen with Erasmus. Dante's *De Monarchia* may now be read without moral guilt; and the faithful have had permission for nearly a century to dip into the early astronomers—Kepler, Copernicus, and Galileo. Charles Darwin, strange to say, has never been condemned, though Erasmus Darwin's *Zoonomia* is still on the list. So also are a host of authors whom the world will never forget—Descartes, Spinoza, Malebranche, Kant, Bacon, Sir Thomas Browne, Locke, Hobbes, Gibbon, J. S. Mill, Taine, Bergson, Bossuet, Lord Acton, Döllinger, Samuel Richardson, Addison, Goldsmith, Heine, Victor Hugo, and, piquantly enough, one of the latest subjects of Roman canonisation, the Blessed Robert Bellarmine. Of course, not everything of all these men is condemned—Bossuet, for instance, only in one of his least known writings, and not in that monumental book in which he marshalled the historical evidence of the Catholic centuries against Papal Infallibility. Bellarmine, also, was condemned for one book only, and for a very short time; but on the other hand we must not forget great men like Mabillon, who have escaped the Index only by private influence or by luck.

If all this story reads rather like history from the moon, and if this Index of 1929, in one sense the newest thing of the moment, seems in another sense the most prehistoric, suggesting nothing but stale antiquarianism or idle curiosity, let us now consider the actual working of this system in our own day. Newman, the greatest Roman of them all, admitted freely that he found his fellow-Romanists less educated than outsiders; some distinguished Frenchmen and Germans are ready to confess the same, but the ordinary apologist, especially the recent convert, always asks us to take his word for the contrary. Here and there you may find Roman Catholics enumerating, with some pride, the scholars for whom they claim world-wide, as apart from merely sectarian, eminence. Dr. Rifaux is, or was, an intellectual layman deeply concerned for the future of his Church. He enumerated in 1905, among its great men who could hold their own anywhere, ten biblical critics and theologians, eleven Church historians, twelve philosophers, six men of letters, and six scientists. Of these last I doubt whether even the name is known to the majority of living English scientists. Of the other thirty-three a startlingly large proportion have incurred, in virtue of their approach to the standards of non-Romanist scholarship, the serious disapproval of the hierarchy. Since 1905 eight have been actually put on the Index and five more have suffered almost equal degradation. One

of the most distinguished, Mignot Bishop of Albi, on the testimony of a friend, 'dared not reprint in a volume his letters to his clergy, lest the book should be put on the Index.' Another, Vacandard the historian of the Inquisition, saw many inferior men put over his head, and died recently in comparative obscurity. Duchesne, the greatest of recent Roman Catholic Church historians, is on the Index; F. X. Kraus, almost as good a scholar, escaped it only by adopting pseudonyms and similar subterfuges. Brunetière, though not condemned by name, was so evidently struck at in person by Pius X. in the encyclical *Pascendi* that it exposed him to insult and broke his heart. Ermoni was excommunicated, and died practically of starvation. Loisy's fate would have been similar if his talents and learning had not earned him a professorship in Paris when the Church cast him out. Lagrange has had writings officially condemned, and, unless he had submitted, would doubtless have been indexed. Thirty per cent., therefore, of these boasted Roman scholars have found it impossible to work without outstepping, sooner or later, the Roman limitations.

These facts accord ill with the frequent assurances we receive from within, and especially from converts. Mr. Leacock, in one of his most amusing essays, describes his experiences with a medium. One great man after another is evoked—Napoleon, Lincoln, and so on—and each, through the medium, begins with the same stereotyped assurance: 'Oh! if only you knew what it is like to be here!' Somehow, however, uniformity fails to carry conviction; we feel here, what the pious Romanist Duggan has confessed, that there is something seriously deceptive in this outward unanimity displayed in the face of outsiders.[3] Not that we need suspect personal insincerity: in the nature of the case, those who come forward to testify are a select few; and Messrs. Belloc and Chesterton and Knox (to name only three distinguished champions of the moment) may mean every word they say, yet convey a distorted impression of the whole system. It is a question of different idiosyncrasies and varying proportions. Nobody can study the Roman Church without realising how great an institution it is in many directions, and how much scope it can afford to any soul that happens to be in pre-established harmony with those particular directions. But not all of us are born to such pre-established harmony; nor are we likely to find what some of these converts have found. There is no reason to question the substantial accuracy of their description of their own feelings on this point. For some minds, even though no such doctrines as the Roman had existed, it would have been necessary to invent

[3] Duggan's *Steps towards Reunion* is on the Index, but I know enough of his life and character to speak advisedly of his piety and his unconsciousness of any [illegible]

them. And a great many others can play about within certain definite limitations without feeling the pinch of those limitations by personal experience. A bluebottle fly impresses us with thorough content and enjoyment in the freedom of an inn parlour. He runs up and down the window like a spark in the chimney, he threads an infinity of airy mazes round our head; he takes advantage of our baldness, but that adds piquancy to his sport; and we reflect that whatever seems least reasonable in his evolutions may, after all, be providentially ordained. Even in an inn parlour the bluebottle is among the most wonderful of God's creatures. Yet there are other flies who feel the irresistible need of open air and wider space, and who would far rather take the risk of a predatory swallow than of the spider's web and the slimy fly-trap that crowns the parlour ceiling.

Therefore, writers more distinguished even than the three already named have delivered their testimony in words which seem to agree far more exactly with ascertained and undeniable facts. Melchior Cano, one of the greatest of the Fathers at the Council of Trent, pilloried the shortcomings of censorship of his own day. He knows of a priest (he tells us) who 'is fully convinced that there is no falsehood whatsoever in anything that has been printed,' since it is unthinkable that the authorities would not only license falsehoods, but even fortify them with copyright. 'The multitude reads these books all the more incautiously, because it sees them approved not only by the civil magistrates, but even by the official censors of doctrine in Christ's Church.' And the men who supply fiction in answer to popular demands 'imagine that they have the more liberty in the matter, since they see most famous authors taking it as a true rule of history to write those things which are regularly accounted as true.' So far Cano; now let us hear another contemporary.

'How can you dream of publishing new books,' wrote the orthodox Latinius, in January 1559, from Rome, to his friend Masius, 'in a time when nearly all the old are taken away? For years to come, I fancy, none of our people will write anything but letters.' . . . The Council of Trent acknowledged that [the previous Index] had laid an excessive burden on learned men.[4]

Again, a pathetic letter from an orthodox scholar in Germany to Cardinal Baronius points out that the Index forbids him practically all the dictionaries and scientific editions which he needs for his researches; he begs most abjectly for some freedom, in reward for the help he has been able to give Baronius.

When we come to modern times the story is still the same. Newman's letters show his bitter disillusion; and (what is still

[4] *Quarterly Review, loc. cit.* p. 597. The whole page is well worth reading from this point of view.

more important) they reveal to his friends the very things which he was trying not only to hide, but even to deny, at almost the same moment, in his *Apologia*. He writes: 'How can I fight with such a chain on my arm? It is like the Persians driven to fight under the lash.' And he echoes that old cynical proverb on the general stupidity of the ruling authorities: '*Quantula sapientia regimur!*' W. G. Ward, the next greatest among that great batch of converts, complained in a private letter to Newman that 'a line of philosophical thought which is substantially true and most important may find its way into the Index for a time'; the remedy is 'external submission and silence.' Loisy wrote: 'My mind would no more be able to live in the intellectual atmosphere of [Pius X.'s] encyclical *Pascendi*, than my lungs could breathe at the bottom of the sea. This full and entire submission, of which Mgr. Merry del Val speaks, could be nothing but a lie on my part . . . a shameless gesture, contrary to all morality.' His friend the Abbé de Meissas wrote: 'The Roman Index forbids all books which might lead to the light, or might at least put us on the way to it.'

Father Tyrrell was one of the most original English-speaking thinkers in the Roman Church since Newman; perhaps he exceeded all except Friedrich von Hügel, who himself owed immunity from the Index mainly to his social prestige and his prudent diplomacy. Tyrrell, when he left the Jesuits, wrote to his own General that Roman clerical education was out of date by three centuries, that the censorship was engineered by men 'who know literally nothing . . . of any *living* subject whatever'; and that 'it would be indeed strange, or even miraculous, if such men had an intelligible answer to questions whose very terms they had studiously made themselves incapable of understanding.' Two others who left the Jesuits after many years' experience, Count v. Hoensbroech and Mr. Barrett, bear similar testimony. The former was himself censor for the German province in 1890 and 1891; he writes: 'When the interest of the Order is opposed, not the smallest regard is paid to personal freedom, nor to the results of scientific investigation or individual ability. The censorship deletes and the author submits; the punitive authority punishes and the culprit remains dumb.' Mr. Barrett writes: '[The author] may entirely disagree with the views thus foisted upon him [by the censor], but he has no alternative but to submit. . . . A Jesuit scientist, therefore, can never freely publish his real opinions on scientific questions.' Mr. Joseph McCabe, who was distinguished in the Franciscan Order as Father Anthony, tells us that the censor 'has to exercise a judgment of an unusually delicate character. The result is confusion and tyranny . . . so it is with science and philosophy;

the best English and German scientists are heterodox, and when a priest pays his visit [to a family] and sees their works lying about he not infrequently demands that they be destroyed.' In 18 the Abbé Harrent wrote a book on *The Schools of Antioch* in the fourth century. His bishop demanded that he should submit to the censor. He replied: 'I am not one of those who write history to order, and who are ready to falsify it in order to sav what they call their "principles."' The bishop insisted on his rights; Harrent resigned his benefice and left the Church. But such revolts, naturally, are very few in proportion. The Roman Catholic cleric has been carefully educated to be fit for no other livelihood; moreover, he, like the layman, is often very naturally and sincerely attached to the Church, even when he is most indignant with the hierarchy. His defection may mean the rupture of his strongest and oldest social ties; the sacrifice is enormous in money, in social prestige, and in human affection. That is why the large majority conform, even among those who have read enough and thought enough to feel the galling burden of this censorship.

True, there are far more rebels than the public often suspects. Houtin records the startling fact that Paris has more priests on the streets—*sur le pavé*—than in office. The formation of an ex-priests' society showed that it was possible to enrol 50 members—working now as cabdrivers, artisans, etc. For such waifs and strays naturally drift to the capital; naturally, also, large proportion of them have not gone out for mainly scientific or religious reasons. Yet Houtin's own case is illuminating in it revelation of the conflict between religion, science, and censorship The son of a peasant, like most of his fellow-priests, he became steady and industrious pupil, and thence a teacher, at the seminary of his native province, Anjou. There, by ill-luck, he became interested in the early bishops of Angers, and undertook to writ their history. A study of the sources convinced him, as Duchesne had already convinced himself independently, that the most famous of these early bishops, and especially St. René, were purely legendary, and had probably never existed. This, however, was not to be endured; therefore the authorities, unable to mee his facts, tried to muzzle him by coercion. He discovered that there were reasons in the background. On the strength of the legend that St. René, in his boyhood, spent seven years in th grave and was then raised from the dead, a fraternity had been formed which collected money for the souls of unbaptised infants a proceeding very difficult to reconcile with orthodox theology and certainly incompatible with the historical evidence, or rathe want of evidence, for St. René's existence. In the face of this and similar vested interests Houtin's struggle was of course hopeless. From that time forward there was a steady conflict between his

ecclesiastical superiors and his historical conscience; first he went out and earned his living as a free-lance journalist, and finally he left the Church. His recent autobiography ought to be in every public library; it has been translated into English under the title of *A Priest's Life* (Watts & Co.). His bias is natural; but he was a man who had schooled himself to accuracy, and none of his adversaries, I believe, has ever convicted him of any serious misstatement of fact. Houtin's autobiography is a strange story, but no stranger than that of George Tyrrell, nor than those articles of St. George Mivart in *The Nineteenth Century* and the *Fortnightly Review*, which led to his dying excommunicate.[5] Robert Dell, at the same time, wrote of his hierarchy, 'their rusty and antiquated weapons have failed them; they have been driven back into their own entrenchment, and as a last hope they have taken refuge from the modern artillery in our underground cavern, the atmosphere of which is becoming so stifling though they can no longer control their subordinates, who are forced to come out one by one into the open air to escape from being asphyxiated.' Tyrrell's own expression is that he gradually realised he was in a prison, none the less a prison because he had gone in of his own accord and thrown the key away. His simile has gained added interest from the fact that Mr. Chesterton has since borrowed it and has attempted, by that legerdemain of rabbits and billiard-balls which we now know by heart, to twist it in the opposite direction.

A German contemporary, Mumbauer, expressed his sense of nausea and suffocation even more emphatically. We Catholics, he wrote, are shut up in a Ghetto; we may not attend ordinary schools or universities; we must be taught by ourselves, separately from the rest of the world; the result is, that civilisation goes on its own way and leaves us shut up in our own back street. About the same time a number of German Catholics published a formal complaint demanding that they should no longer be outlawed, but allowed to mix freely with their fellow-men; and that, as a preliminary, the Index should be scrapped. Yet the answer to that was a new edition of the Index by Leo XIII.; and now this republication of a few weeks ago, 'revised by command of His Holiness Pope Pius XI.' and with a vernacular preface. There, we discover that no Frenchman who values his soul may refer to that current modern encyclopædia in which he is most likely to find whatever information he needs on the spur of the moment, Larousse's *Grand Dictionnaire*

[5] *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. xlvii. (1900), pp. 51 and 425; *cf.* Robert Dell on p. 669. *Fortnightly Review*, vol. lxvii. (1900), p. 24. Le Page Renouf, one of the few English-speaking scientists in the Roman Church of that day, is also on the Index.

Universel. It is piquant to note how many great French authors are forbidden by name, quite apart from those who are excluded by general rules, as adversaries or critics of the Roman faith. If it were really possible to deprive a whole nation of these books, and of the 'orthodox' books which owe most of their value to those forbidden predecessors, it is hardly too much to say that the result would be a population of dunces.

But, it will be answered, there is no such fear; the thing is physically impossible. That is true; and therein lies the best apology for the Index. A correspondent sends me his own experiences of many years in the Jesuit Order. Although the cardinal repeats on p. xvi., after the example of his predecessors, that these prohibitions hold good for every part of the world, and for every language into which the books may have been translated, yet my correspondent is certain that only the most insignificant minority of Romanists, in a free country like Britain, know the provisions of the Index. He instances Montaigne and the *Religio Medici*, concerning which the chief Jesuit organ in this country, the *Month*, has in recent times printed essays calculated to attract readers to those books; and he adds: 'I myself never knew that they were forbidden, and I am quite sure that my superiors had not the faintest idea of it.' But, however futile these rules may be in certain directions, the spirit which animates them is deadly for real learning. Most poisonous of all is its direct inheritance from the Middle Ages, when discipline rested on a foundation of spying and tale-bearing. Just as it was accounted criminal in heretics not to have betrayed their fellows, and as the Inquisition was willing to welcome, or even at a pinch to compel, the evidence of a ten-year-old boy against his father, and as this is also the age-long tradition of many Roman Catholic schools and of all their seminaries, and as it formed an integral part of Pius X.'s anti-modernist campaign, so it is still enshrined in the most recent code of Canon Law, and is quoted from thence in the Cardinal's preface to our present Index (p. xvi.). All the faithful are bound in conscience to report to their bishop or to the Pope whatever books they judge to be mischievous; and they are assured that the names of the informers will be kept under seal of secrecy. It must be borne in mind that no reason is ever given for the condemnation of any particular book; the damnatory sentence is peremptory and irresponsible, and the victim has no real chance of explanation. It is this 'stabbing in the back,' this deliberate encouragement of espionage and tale-bearing, which arouses my correspondent's bitterest indignation, as it aroused that of Tyrrel and Barrett and Hoensbroech; moreover, this was one of the saddest disillusions under which Newman suffered, together with many other converts of his generation. Therefore, however

inoperative this serio-comic list may be in detail, the pressure behind it is crushing. Even out of Newman it crushed half the life-force. Not only may a bishop condemn writers by his own authority and force them practically to choose between falsification of their real opinions and revolt—as Houtin's diocesan said to him, 'A bishop does not discuss, he condemns'—but even the *ordinary parish priest is commissioned to lay his leaden hand upon* literature and science (p. xxv.). To quote for the third time from my correspondent, who in effect is only repeating to me what many Roman Catholics have put into print already: 'It is difficult to see how any conscientious Roman Catholic can take any sort of post in a modern printing or publishing concern, or work in a public library; for nearly all such concerns print or distribute forbidden books.'

On reflection, it will be seen how nearly this concerns the movement, to which a considerable number of members are pledged beforehand in this present Parliament, for erecting and financing Roman Catholic schools out of public money. But that is far too wide a question for consideration at the end of an already lengthy article.

G. G. COULTON.

THE FUTURE OF THE BLASPHEMY LAWS

Those who believe that they live in an age of toleration may wonder why the House of Commons should have devoted its time, as recently as January 24, 1930, to consider and vote in favour of the second reading of a Bill for the abolition of prosecutions for schism, heresy, blasphemy, blasphemous libel, and atheism. For there is a very general impression that any law there may be on this subject is rarely put into operation, or, if it is, that the law has reached a stage which is reasonably practicable and fairly just; and accordingly that proposals for its abolition or alteration are entirely unnecessary.

One object of this article is to demonstrate that this impression is ill-founded.

I

At the outset it is necessary to state briefly how the English law on irreligious expressions stands to-day.

By a statute of 1547 it is an offence, punishable with fine and imprisonment of unlimited extent, to 'deprave dispise or contempne' the Sacrament, by words or in any other manner. By an Act of 1558 the laity may be punished (there are special penalties for the clergy) on a first offence by a fine of 100 marks, or in default by six months' imprisonment, on a second offence by a fine of 400 marks, or in default by one year's imprisonment, and on a third offence by imprisonment for life and forfeiture of all goods, if they speak 'in the derogation depraving or despising' of the Book of Common Prayer or any part of its contents. By an Act of 1698 (as amended in 1813) any person educated in the Christian religion who, by writing, printing, teaching or advise speaking, asserts that there are more gods than one, or denie the Christian religion to be true or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be of Divine authority, becomes, on a first conviction and in the absence of recantation, *ipso facto* incapable of holding any office, ecclesiastical, civil or military, and on a second conviction must be sentenced to three years imprisonment and deprived of many of his civil rights. And in addition to the statutes which provide for the summary

conviction of persons who profanely curse or swear or publish profane words or libels in the streets, the Burial Laws Amendment Act of 1880 makes it a misdemeanour to use a funeral as an occasion for bringing the Christian religion or religious organisations or persons into obloquy.

Then, by the common law, it is a misdemeanour, punishable in theory with unlimited fine and imprisonment, to publish to a single person spoken or written words about the Deity, the Bible, or religion, which are so scurrilous as to pass the limits of decent controversy, with the intention to insult believers or sympathisers with Christianity; or (probably) to commit blasphemous actions; or to conspire to commit a blasphemous offence.

Further, the ecclesiastical courts have a remnant of their old jurisdiction over some forms of irreligious expression which they may punish by excommunication, and, by an Act of 1813 by sentencing the excommunicate to imprisonment for six months.

II

The impression that the law relating to religious offences is rarely put into operation is to some extent justified; indeed, of the older statutes on this subject, Professor Kenny has happily remarked that they 'have lingered into longevity only through having been left in lethargy.' But they are still in force, and subject to the limited restrictions of the Vexatious Indictments Act, they may still be enforced by any person (not necessarily an official of the Crown) who cares to set the machinery of the law in motion and to run the faint risk of being sued for malicious prosecution. That the possibility of someone instituting such proceedings is not too remote for consideration is illustrated by the actions of Hetherington in 1840. He was prosecuted for blasphemous libel, and, ostensibly to demonstrate the fact that the common law was never put into operation against persons of substance, he prosecuted a number of reputable publishers for the same offence. Of these Moxon was convicted of having published a poem which nearly twenty years before had been held to be a blasphemous libel—Shelley's *Queen Mab*. It is true that Moxon was never sentenced, for then the court exercised the discretion which it has in the case of common law misdemeanours and more recent statutory offences. On prosecutions for some of the old statutory offences, however, there is no such discretion. If, to call attention to the continued existence of these Acts, or from mere malice, someone chooses to prosecute those who speak in derogation of the Book of Common Prayer (and unfavourable comment has not been directed exclusively to the deposited

[illegib]le); or those who deny the inspiration of the Bible which they have been taught to believe (and this teaching must usually have preceded discovery of what is known as the higher criticism), on conviction the judge must pronounce the sentences provided by the respective statutes.

That there are persons willing to prosecute for religious offences may be gathered from the fact that in the last twenty years there have been at least eight convictions in England for the common law offence, and a number of summary convictions for profanity in the streets. And in the old statutes one may see, loaded and primed, antiquated yet still deadly blunderbusses, ready to the hand of malice, folly, bigotry, and zeal.

III

The impression that the present law is both practicable and just seems to exist largely because the statutory law is forgotten. Yet it would be difficult to find an intelligent adult prepared to justify the continued existence of these Acts. On the one hand, if there is no justification for the common law, there is none for these statutes. On the other hand, if there is any justification for the common law, so far as the statutes merely duplicate the common law they are unnecessary; and so far as they go outside its scope, either in the severity of their penalties or in the nature of the offences created by them (except perhaps in cases of swearing and street profanity), they are felt to be the relics of an intolerant past. It is a truism that there are fashions in belief, and there is a current belief in some degree of toleration among those who have never turned to Milton or to Mill for a rationalisation of their views. It is unnecessary to ask how this belief has arisen. It is as impertinent to call it the result of apathy as it is grandiloquent to call it the Spirit of the Age. That it exists may be shown by pointing out that the reasons which induced our forefathers to enact these prohibitions are no longer accepted as valid. He who was most likely to deprave the Anglican method of administering the Sacrament was not the infidel, but the Papist; he who was most likely to despise the Book of Common Prayer was not the atheist, but the dissenter. The Acts of the sixteenth century were part of a system of enforcing religious conformity, or at least of suppressing open nonconformity; but that attempt has long since been abandoned. One of the reasons for enacting the Act of 1698 (suggested in its preamble) is that profanity might provoke Almighty God to acts of retribution upon the nation which permitted it—an idea which the strictest orthodoxy would now hesitate to proclaim from the housetops; another reason was to exclude

from office men of heterodox religious views—a policy which has been deliberately reversed by Parliament within the las century. Some such considerations as these, no doubt, as lon ago as 1889 led Sir E. Clarke, then Solicitor-General, to admit 'these statutes might very well be repealed,' and various Home Secretaries in the present century to reiterate that view. And these M nisters would not have been regarded as revolutionary i they had included in this suggestion the repeal of the Act which permits the moribund ecclesiastical courts to order the imprisonment of excommunicates.

But the common law itself is neither just nor practicable.

As a natural result of the history of the common law offences of blasphemy and blasphemous libel it is not an offence to attack any specific religion other than Christianity, or any organisation of religion other than the Established Church. Attacks on othe religions or other organisations, unless they amount to a summary offence against order in the streets, or involve the publication of a defamatory libel, are legally blameless. In the capital of an Empire which has millions of dissenting and non-Christian subjects, and prides itself on the equality of all its subjects before the law, it is a special offence to sneer at such religious dogma as a Laodicean member of the Anglican Church may remember from his confirmation in adolescence, and yet permissible for that very member of the Church to make with impunity the most provocative attacks upon the religious organisation of fervent nonconformists or to scoff coarsely at the beliefs of the most devout Mahometans or Jews.

Then the common law is directed only against those who express themselves vulgarly. So long as the decencies of controversy are observed it is no offence to attack the very fundamentals of Christianity. Anyone with sufficient education to string the words together may say that there is grave doubt about the doctrine of the immaculate conception; but to say the same thing vulgarly—*i.e.*, plainly or in the only language habitually used and understood by a large proportion of the population—is to commit a crime. Vulgarity is not confined to the poor, but plain speech is more common among them than among others; and though in many cases there is little sting, because little truth, in the gibe that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor, it is true of blasphemous offences. The framers of the eighteenth-century statute against swearing provided a heavier penalty for gentlemen than for common soldiers; by a curious irony the nineteenth century reversed this intelligent policy with respect to the common law. When in 1883 Lord Coleridge insisted that to deny the truth of Christianity was not criminal *per se*, he was propounding the

liberal view of the law; but it may be doubted whether he foresaw the consequences of that view. It is now the street-corner pedlar or tub-thumper, and not the opulent author, whose blasphemy is punished. From this aspect the common law of blasphemy is no respecter of opinions, but merely of persons. It has become genteel.

One consequence of this standard of criminality is that the trial of a defendant charged with publishing blasphemous words or libels at common law puts an honest jury in the intolerable position of having to decide questions not only of fact, but of taste, and of taste upon a topic which they are peculiarly unqualified to judge. The writer has shown elsewhere that the present test of guilt is not too clearly defined [1]; but it may be said that in normal cases the jury have to decide whether the defendant published the matter complained of, and if so whether that matter so violates the decencies of controversy that the publisher must be taken to have intended to insult believers in or sympathisers with Christianity. The majority, if not all, of the jurors are presumably Christian, for unless they demur they will have been sworn upon the Gospel; and they would probably resent the suggestion of inferiority in themselves which any attack on their beliefs would convey. The kind of matter which now forms the subject of indictments almost invariably contains ridicule of beliefs or persons connected with Christianity, for, as Sir James Stephen pointed out years ago in condemning the law of blasphemy, ridicule is one of the weapons of controversy. How are the jurors, setting a higher collective standard in public than any one of them might adopt in private, and this without any consciousness of inconsistency or deliberate partiality, to dissever their repugnance to a gross attack upon Christianity from their natural dislike of any attack upon Christianity? What prospect is there of any such jury, which contains only one member with the mentality of the seventeenth century, acquitting the publisher of attacks on Christianity of the charge of intending thereby to insult believers?

IV

Of the numerous objections to the law as it stands to-day enough has been said to demonstrate that it is unsatisfactory. But what is the remedy?

This subject is unfortunately clouded with religious and political prejudice. The former needs no explanation. The latter arises from the parliamentary history of the last decade. Some few years ago, following an agitation against Communist

[1] Nokes, *A History of the Crime of Blasphemy* (1928), pp. 95—102.

Sunday schools, the House of Lords passed the Seditious and Blasphemous Teaching to Children Bill, the name of which, unlike that of many statutes, explains itself; and in 1927 a similar Bill reached a third reading in the Commons and only failed to become law because the Government could not spare time for a non-Government Bill. As a counterblast to these Bills members of the present Government party have at least four times since 1923 introduced a Bill in the terms of that debated this session; and, as was the case when Bradlaugh backed similar Bills in the 'eighties, until this last occasion some of the unpopularity attaching to the political ideas of its sponsors seems to have been transferred to the Bill itself. The question, therefore, whether the existing law should be extended or abolished is not free from party considerations. And it will always be difficult to dissociate this matter from political prejudice, because at the root of any suggested alteration in the law there lies this question—what is the object of the law of blasphemy? And this in turn involves the question—what is the function of the State towards discussion on religion?

The time has fortunately passed when those in authority could act on the simple principle that they would punish merely because they were displeased. It may be conceded with Mill that 'the manner of asserting an opinion, even though it be a true opinion, may undoubtedly be very objectionable, and may justly incur severe censure'—but not necessarily the censure of the law. The Legislature dare not now openly adopt the attitude of the old woman who sees or hears something of which she disapproves, and exclaims 'Shocking; there ought to be a law against it!' Even under the Commonwealth, when unlawful assemblies took upon themselves to punish blasphemers, though their brutality suggests that they were actuated less by reverence for a merciful Deity than by anger at the affront to vengeful humanity, they never avowed such a motive.

It is a peculiarity of the laws of blasphemy that throughout their history men have sought to justify them. No one, unless infatuated with the notion that all crime is pathological, troubles to discuss whether murder or theft should be punished. Though discussion on the appropriate punishment of these crimes may never end, little is heard of whether they ought to be treated as criminal—for the simple reason that they are obviously anti-social. In the case of blasphemy, however, the lack of any obvious detriment to the State or its subjects is so pronounced that even the most pious have to explain why blasphemy should be penalised. This has produced a great volume of explanation, justification, or excuse.

A consideration of all but the most fantastic of these justifica-

tions supplies a clue to the answer to the second question asked above. They all presuppose that blasphemy involves some secular consequence harmful to society, and the true answer to that question seems to be that the only function of the State towards discussions on religion is to punish such discussions when they involve a secular consequence inimical to the State.

It has been shown that some of the reasons for the early statutes no longer have any validity; and the same is true of the earlier legal justifications for the common law offences. They were regarded as closely akin to seditious offences; indeed, in some cases the same words were described as both blasphemous and seditious. The logical justification for this description was that it was seditious to speak or write in subversion of the law, Christianity was part of the law, and therefore to speak in subversion of Christianity was a seditious offence. But both the premises of this proposition have now gone. It is no longer seditious merely to speak in subversion of the law, and Christianity is no longer part of the law. Then again it was said that blasphemy struck at the sanctity of oaths, and that as these were the basis of the civil fabric blasphemy amounted to an attack upon the State. But the permission which Parliament has given to substitute affirmation in almost all the cases where oaths were essential has rendered fallacious an argument which never had much to support it.

Then later it was suggested that blasphemy depraved 'the morals of the people'; that attacks on religion destroyed belief in those religious sanctions upon which morality was assumed to depend. Yet, since all but gross attacks on religion have been in fact permitted to pass unchallenged by the law for more than half a century, it is open to those who now maintain this view to produce evidence, first of an increase in immorality during that period, and, secondly, to demonstrate the connexion between that increased immorality and such attacks. Others will take the view of Lord Sumner, who in 1917 said: 'In the present day reasonable men do not apprehend the dissolution or the downfall of society because religion is publicly assailed by methods not scandalous.'

The words 'by methods not scandalous' may have been added in deference to or in recognition of the existing common law; but Lord Sumner's statement would have been equally true without them. If, as experience shows, the subtle permeation of a considerable part of society by disbelief in religion does not involve the dissolution of the State, it is difficult to see how the same disbelief expressed scandalously in public could have that result. The nearest approximation to such a consequence might be a riot caused by a crowd hostile to one who scandalously

assailed religion. A breach of the peace is thus the only secular consequence inimical to the State which can reasonably be anticipated to flow from the publication of unorthodox religious matter.

The tendency of such publications to cause a breach of the peace has always had a fascination for those who found it necessary to justify the existence of blasphemous offences. It may be questioned whether all who spoke of a breach of the peace intended to convey the same idea; some no doubt thought of an assault or riot following publication, some perhaps contemplated the dissolution of society through the weakening of faith in religious sanctions, but others probably did not clearly distinguish between a breach of the public peace and a breach of their own peace of mind. The reiteration of the phrase has had its effect. A jury, in considering whether the publisher of blasphemous matter intended thereby to insult believers in Christianity, must now also consider whether, in the circumstances, publication was likely to cause a breach of the peace. But it is not, and never has been, necessary to prove that an actual breach of the peace occurred; for example, the last man to be convicted of blasphemous libel at common law was selling pamphlets in a London street and two purchasers remonstrated with him. But violence was neither used nor threatened; indeed, the seller was arrested for obstruction, and might never have been charged with anything more serious if it had not been discovered that he had already been convicted of publishing blasphemous libels. Admittedly it is impossible to say what might have happened if the seller had not been arrested.

Here the religious riots of India are usually called in aid as an example of the effect of the resentment roused by religious attacks. But India's years of religious hostilities and traditional methods of dealing with religious insult are elements entirely absent from the English situation. In England no such conditions exist, and there is probably a higher proportion of the population whose religious sincerity would induce them to treat assaults on religion, if not with silent disapproval, at least with dignified remonstrance. Experience shows that the publication of blasphemous matter in England in the twentieth century does not usually provoke a breach of the peace. It cannot be denied, however, that both sincerely religious men of quick passion (and probably the greater their emotional response to religion the quicker their passion) and the loungers and roughs, to whose stunted intelligence and atrophied emotions religion can make little or no appeal, but to whom any excuse is good enough for a row, might make common cause against one who assailed religion in public.

If this contingency is the sole reason for the punishment of blasphemy it does not seem sufficiently serious to demand any special law to meet it. It is true that in some cases the law must take preventive measures. If, for example, after the publication of a seditious libel urging the populace to overthrow the Government by force those responsible for prosecution were to wait until the libel took effect, there might then be no Government and no law. But such a case provides no analogy with blasphemy.

Finally, the argument that the mere existence of a law against blasphemy lessens the likelihood of a breach of the peace when that law is broken—that readers or an audience, knowing that the blasphemer may be prosecuted, will not take the law into their own hands—has the solitary merit of ingenuity. On any rare occasion when a mob is bent on violence against a blasphemer the prospect of seeing their quarry prosecuted is not likely to act as a restraint. On all other occasions this precaution is superfluous. Though it may be admitted (if rarely avowed) that one of the reasons for the existence of a criminal law is the necessity for avenging the resentment of the injured, lest they should avenge themselves, it may be doubted whether there are many crimes for whose existence no other reason can be advanced. The illogical result of pretending to punish an action solely to prevent private vengeance may be observed in the law of defamation. Apart from the anomalous defence of justification of matter published in the public interest, the crime of defamatory libel bears some resemblance to the crime of blasphemy—for, when there is no repetition, only scurrilous defamatory libels are prosecuted, and the jury has to consider the possibility of a breach of the peace. Yet, as it is not a crime to speak, face to face with the person defamed, those words which, if written and sent by post from the other end of England, could be indicted as a defamatory libel, it is obvious either that undue emphasis is laid upon the prospect of private vengeance or that the State can afford to risk that possibility in many cases. That the State can afford to risk it in cases of blasphemy is shown by the fact that the law has abandoned the office of avenging the resentment caused by all but scurrilous attacks on Christianity; and an attack couched in polished language may be no less offensive than street-corner crudities. It is further demonstrated by the fact that the State has found it unnecessary to prevent private vengeance arising from resentment of attacks on any other religion; and, as Lord Sumner has pointed out, 'to insult a Jew's religion is not less likely to provoke a fight than to insult an Episcopalian's.'

Thus for the existence of the impracticable and unjust common

law there appears to be no more logical justification than for the continuance of the statutory laws against blasphemy.

V

But public opinion is not based on logic; and those who are unconvinced that it is desirable to abolish all prosecutions for this crime will probably agree that it would be possible to devise improvements of the existing law.

It has been suggested that the law should only punish the publication of blasphemy when it actually results in a breach of the peace. In such an event a Gallio might be willing to treat both the provoker and the provoked with an equally contemptuous indifference; a philosopher might treat them as jointly blameworthy; a pedant might treat him who was so provoked that his religion was no brake upon his violence as the more blameworthy; but a police-court magistrate or bench of justices, wishing to act upon the general assumption that the provoker is to blame, might discover, in the absence of a specific prohibition of blasphemy, that it was the provoked who had committed an offence (assault, for example), while the provoker had committed none, and perhaps in strict law could not even be bound over. And it is unreasonable to create an offence which must depend for its commission upon the actions of persons provoked by the party accused.

A proposal not infrequently made is that the common law should be replaced by a measure similar to that contained in the Indian Penal Code, by section 298 of which, 'whoever, with the deliberate intention of wounding the religious feelings of any person, utters any word or makes any sound in the hearing of that person, or makes any gesture in the sight of that person, or places any object in the sight of that person, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description' (*i.e.*, rigorous—with hard labour—or simple) 'for a term which may extend to one year, or with fine, or with both.'

Such a provision would remove that partiality in the common law which excludes many religions from its protection. It would also remedy the partiality which convicts the vulgar but acquits the cultured, for, as has been stated already, it is possible to accomplish the deliberate intention of wounding religious feeling without resort to scurrilous language. But this involves the abandonment of the advance which the common law made when it established the rule that merely to deny the fundamentals of Christianity was not criminal; that advance inevitably involves the distinction between cultured and crude attacks on religion; and, unless the whole law on this subject is abolished, it must

always remain necessary to choose between the partiality which penalises vulgarity and the impartiality which makes every unorthodoxy criminal. No reasonable man is now prepared to return to the latter alternative, and in this respect, and others, the Indian provision is objectionable as being too wide. It is also objectionable on the ground that it would perpetuate one common law element of criminality, and therefore would involve a jury in much the same difficulties as they now experience.

Any alteration in the law should, it is submitted, include the following matters :—

The abolition of the existing law of blasphemy, including swearing. This would involve the repeal of the statute law and some bye-laws, and a prohibition of prosecutions for the common law and ecclesiastical offences, save, as to the latter, when committed by the clergy.

A provision making it an offence to publish blasphemous words or libels to, or to commit blasphemous actions in the presence of, more than one person.

A definition of blasphemous as (*a*) relating to any recognised religion, the Deity thereof, or its revered writings ; (*b*) being grossly offensive to any reasonable professor of that religion ; and (*c*) being in fact grossly offensive to the persons complaining.

A definition of publication which would preserve the existing law as to privilege, and exclude solicited statements—*i.e.*, genuine replies to apparently genuine questions or arguments.

A provision requiring the evidence of the persons complaining of being grossly offended.

A provision giving jurisdiction over the offences to courts of summary jurisdiction, with power to sentence on conviction to a fine of not more than 10*l*. or to imprisonment for not more than fourteen days for a first offence, or to imprisonment for not more than six months for any subsequent offence.

The application of the existing power to destroy blasphemous libels in the disposition of the person convicted of blasphemous libels as here defined.

G. D. Nokes.

THE SARACENS IN SWITZERLAND

AMONG the crowds of travellers to Switzerland who visit the hospice and pass of St. Bernard, how many realise that, early in the tenth century, Saracens seized this dominating position and held it with a stranglehold for half a century? Such, however, was the case, but before narrating these dramatic events we must turn for a while and examine the troubled state of Europe at this period which permitted the irruption.

An important date in history is the coronation of Charlemagne as emperor in 800. Fourteen years later he died, the unchallenged ruler of an empire which stretched across Northern and Central Europe and included many provinces of Italy. Consequently, under Carolingian rule, Switzerland, for the first time since the fall of Rome, formed part of a great empire. She thereby regained her importance as the guardian of the central passes of the Alps.

The death of Charlemagne was followed by decadence, due mainly to the disputes and incapacity of his heirs, aggravated by the unwieldy size of an empire which lacked the communications which Rome had constructed and maintained. In 843, by the Treaty of Verdun, the empire was divided into three sections from east to west, one prince receiving the middle section, which included the provinces which constitute modern Switzerland and part of Italy. The countries beyond the Rhine constituted the eastern section, and the western section included most of modern France.

The break-up of the empire proceeded with increased momentum, and in 888 Rudolph, Duke of the Transjurane duchy, which included the districts of Geneva, Lausanne and Sion, declared himself king. His contemporaries were Louis of Provence, who held the valley of the Rhone as far as Lyons, while, in Italy, Guy, Duke of Spoleto, contended with Berenger of Friuli for the throne of Italy.

We now come to the amazing episode of the Saracens in Switzerland. The rise of Islam, the religion preached by the Prophet Mohammed, was one of the greatest events in history. After his death in A.D. 632, the Arabs, swarming out of their

deserts, overthrew the Persian Empire and, under their Caliphs, conquered eastwards and westwards, until they created the greatest empire that the world had seen, an empire which stretched from Central Asia to Morocco on the Atlantic Ocean. Nor was the force of the movement spent, for, utilising the burning zeal of Berber converts, who served as the rank and file, the Saracens, as they were termed in Europe, landing at Gibraltar, conquered Spain, crossed the Pyrenees, and, destroying Lyons, Macon and other cities, marched as far north as the valley of the Loire. There they suffered a decisive defeat at the hands of Charles Martel in 732, exactly 100 years after the death of Mohammed. Gibbon, who perhaps exaggerated, estimates the importance of the Battle of Tours by remarking that, had the Saracens won, the Koran would have been preached from the pulpits of Oxford.

Towards the end of the ninth century the beautiful Riviera suffered incessantly from the attacks of Saracen pirates, who raided the coast in force, burning the towns and killing or enslaving the unfortunate inhabitants. One band, originally driven by a storm to take refuge in the Gulf of St. Tropez, situated about halfway between Toulon and Cannes, was so pleased with its amenities as a harbour and base that it decided to form a permanent settlement in the country in or about the year 888. Having established themselves on the coast by the usual methods of massacre, they moved inland and constructed a stronghold in the heart of the mountains, which was known as the Grand Fraxinet. The ruins of this fortress, now termed La Garde Freinet, still exist, while Aleppo pines cover the slopes of the range, which commemorates Saracen domination in its name of the 'Mountains of the Moors.' A few words absorbed into the language, a persistence of traits proving Arab blood both in the villagers and in their horses and goats, may also be noted. At Nice the invaders are not forgotten, since one of its quarters is the Canton des Sarrasins. Starting from their new base, the invaders spread rapidly over Provence and Dauphiné, and in 906 crossed Mont Cenis and occupied Piedmont.

According to the chronicles, on which I mainly rely, the Saracens occupied the pass of Mont Joux in 920. This name was a corruption of *Mons Jovis*, so called from a temple dedicated to Jupiter. Incidentally I would mention that it was not until the eleventh century that the pass acquired its present name from the foundation of the celebrated hospice by St. Bernard.

The history of Switzerland from one point of view is the struggle to control the main north to south route from Flanders to Rome along which passed merchants with their furs, tissues, and slaves. Pilgrims, monks, students and soldiers of fortune

was all drawn to Rome, who, in return, spread her civilisation and wares in Northern Europe.

The Saracens, having occupied this key position, soon began to rob and kill travellers. Curiously enough, among their earliest victims were a band of Gauls and *Transmarinorum*, who are obviously Anglo-Saxons, and these pilgrims suffered heavy losses in killed and wounded. In the same year the invaders descended the valley of the Upper Rhone and destroyed the Church of St. Maurice, celebrated as being the first Christian edifice to be built north of the Alps. Another contemporary writer mentions that he visited St. Maurice, where the abbey had recently been burnt by the Saracens, and that he found it desolate without any sign of its former inhabitants. The invaders penetrated far and wide, reaching Lake Constance to the north, while their raids in the canton of Vaud, especially in the fertile district of Gruyère, are still remembered. At this time the country was ruled by Bertha, the widow of Rudolph, on behalf of her son Conrad. She was evidently unable to oppose the Saracens, and was forced to take refuge at Neuchatel.

It may be asked why the Count of Provence made no effort to destroy the invaders before they took root. It appears that he did attack them, but that when he became a claimant for the throne of Lombardy in 943 he actually enlisted the Saracens to hold the Alps against his rival Berenger. This arrangement was not successful, as Berenger became King of Lombardy in 950.

The state of Europe was pitiable at this period, as it was ravaged by Magyars, who were an even worse calamity than the Saracens, in view of their greater numbers and mobility. But, according to local tradition, there was a gleam of sunshine in 950. In this year Conrad, by promising his support to each side, contrived that the two hordes should meet on the field of battle. The struggle was long and bloody, and finally Conrad had the agreeable task of falling on the survivors. He did not, however, extirpate the Saracens, although their position must have become insecure.

In 972 they filled the cup of their iniquity to overflowing by the capture of St. Mayeul, Abbot of Cluny, at the village of Orsières, situated near Martigny in the valley below the Mont Joux pass. The letter of the saint has been preserved and runs: 'I am a helpless prisoner loaded with chains; the torrents of Belial have surrounded me, and the snares of death have seized upon me.'

This outrage stirred the conscience of the people, and from every quarter the Saracens were attacked. At Trois Torrents below Champéry, on the plateau of Vero, they were massacred

in such numbers that the stream ran red, while the prisoners were blinded with hot ashes by the women. In this connexion the name Vero is believed to commemorate the battle-cry of the Christians: *Pro vero deo!* Elsewhere the women cut their hair, dressed in men's clothing and attacked the Saracens with pitchforks and scythes. The final scene of the act was the capture of Fraxinet a few years later. The Saracens fought with the courage of despair, but at last, after an occupation lasting some eighty years, they were all killed or captured.

It remains to inquire what was the impression left by the Saracens. It was deep, so deep that Guillaume de Nangis, whose chronicle deals with the latter part of the thirteenth century, actually heads one of his chapters with the words: '*Ci commencent les chroniques de tous les rois de France, Chrêtiens ou Sarrasins.*' In other words, 'Saracen' is synonymous with 'pagan,' and this appears constantly in the *Chansons de Geste.* To go back further, the town wall of Avenches, the Roman stronghold Aventicum, is still termed *La Muraille des Sarrasins*, and as late as 1690 a deed describes the fishermen of Vallamand as Saracens.

In the Upper Rhone Valley the universal belief exists that certain districts are inhabited by descendants of the Saracens. During a visit which I paid to the historical little town of Sion, whose bishop went to England as Papal Legate in the reign of William the Conqueror, I made inquiries of the curator of its museum. 'You ask about the Saracens,' he said; 'the Val d'Hérens (to the south of Sion) is populated by them. There are no Swiss there.' Needless to say, I visited Evolène, its chief village, where the tradition is still strong.

Again, many families are called Sarrasin. I have inquired, and have ascertained that they believe in their descent from the invaders. Their women in some cases, and also portraits that I have been shown, prove that this belief is not unfounded. A few local names of places, miniature châlets, *maisons Sarrasines*, and wild vines (*vignes Sarrasins*) all testify to the fact that the Saracens stamped themselves indelibly on the country. A friend has informed me that between the Zermatt and Sass valleys are peaks termed Mischabel, Alphubel, and Allalin, and that at the top of the Sass valley is the Monte Moro Pass, by which the Saracens are believed to have entered the valley. The names of the three peaks are believed to be of Arabic origin, and certainly "allalin" might well be the Arabic word signifying "high." In any case, the names given above and the tradition are of considerable interest in view of the fact that these valleys open into the valley of the Rhone.

To conclude, Henri Bordeaux tells of a colony of Saracens who

stablished themselves in an inaccessible valley in neighbouring avoy and his description of their descendants runs :—

Les traits de ces femmes sont d'une surprenante régularité, quelquefois ccentuée, nez busqués, mentons volontaires. On prétend que la race a ardé du sang sarrasin. Elle est brune d'habitude et elle a une noblesse l'allure, une aisance de geste, qui sont exceptionnels dans nos campagnes.

PERCY SYKES

MOUSSORGSKY THE REALIST

THE composer of *Boris Godounov* and *Khovantschina*—two of the finest operas of the nineteenth century—is of all the great musicians of the last hundred years the one about whom we know least; but a biography by a German critic, Oscar von Riesemann, has recently appeared, which gives, if not a complete portrait, at least a vivid sketch of this extraordinary man. Moussorgsky was born in 1839. His grandfather was a nobleman, and, like most of the Russian old nobility, he traced back his descent to the half-mythical Rurik who, about the year 862, did for the Slavonic tribes what the bastard William of Normandy did for the more civilised English—provided them with an aristocracy. Moussorgsky's paternal grandmother was a serf named Irene Yegorovna, and it was not until the year 1820 that Moussorgsky's father, born before wedlock, was made legitimate by ukase of the Senate, and in 1865, thirteen years after his death, his name was permitted to be enrolled on the scroll of the nobility of the Government of Pskov; so that, in spite of his descent from Rurik, the composer remained for the first twenty-six years of his life an illegitimate nobleman. This did not save him, however, from the destiny of 'a younger son of a noble house.' In spite of his showing unusual musical gifts, at an early age he was sent, after being two years in a good classical school, to an army training establishment, and then in 1852 to the Guards' Cadet Academy, where he remained four years, emerging as an ensign in the famous Preobrazhensky Guards. It was then, in the year 1856, that he met in the guard-room a young military doctor who was no other than Alexander Borodin, an amateur musician like himself, who later became one of the famous group of young Russian musicians known as the 'Powerful Coterie'—consisting of Balakirev, Borodin, Moussorgsky, Rimsky-Korsakov and César Cui. Russian music, like Russian literature, began with the nineteenth century. Pushkin (1779–1837) and Gogol (1809–1852) were the first great Russian writers, and similarly Glinka (1803–1857), described by Liszt as the 'Prophet-Patriarch of Russian music,' and Dargomijsky (1813–1869) were the first great national composers. It was in the winter of 1856 that a

regimental comrade took Moussorgsky to the house of Dar-mijsky, where he met Balakirev and César Cui.

Dargomijsky was in the habit of giving musical parties, a from contemporary memoirs Mr. von Riesemann gives following account of these evenings:

> Dargomijsky himself is its central figure, surrounded by a crow graceful young lady singers, whom he taught free of charge and with wh he was so infatuated that he used to declare that he would never ha become a composer had there been no lady singers in the world . . . father, a stiff old aristocrat . . . kept jealous watch to see that str silence was maintained during the performance, and at the slightest no would come down upon the offender with a loud 'Ssh!' The compose sisters, too, were always present—the one old-maidish, despotic and kee critical, the other young and pretty, with a graceful way of handling harp. The musical performances were generally good, even distinguish for Dargomijsky spent much time in getting them up and conducted th in person. Such was the circle into which the seventeen-year-old Mo sorgsky was introduced. He used often to say in later life, as Stassov te us, that his real musical existence dated from this time. Neverthele Dargomijsky, who was then still himself in the stage of development— master works *Russalka* and *The Stone Guest* were not yet written—had first no marked influence upon Moussorgsky. . . .

The feature of these evenings which distinguished them fro the usual musical parties of cultivated amateurs of music at th time in Petersburg was the performance of Russian mus 'simply, naturally and without any striving after effect—in word, as our departed friend Michael Ivanovitch (Glinka) lov to have it done.' Moussorgsky quickly became intimate wi César Cui, who was twenty-two years old, and with Balakire who was twenty-one. With Cui he played the symphonies Schumann as duets on the pianoforte, but from Balakirev he to regular musical instruction. What this instruction amounted we can see from Balakirev's own account communicated Stassov after Moussorgsky's death:

> As I am no theorist I could not give Moussorgsky instruction in ha mony (as Rimsky-Korsakov, for instance, now teaches it), so I confin myself to explaining the different forms of composition; with this obj we played through all Beethoven's symphonies and many of the works Schumann, Schubert, Glinka and others as pianoforte duets. I point out the technical structure of their compositions as we went through the and got him to analyse the various musical forms. So far as I rememb there were few actual professional lessons; these came to an end for o reason or another and were succeeded by friendly exchange of opinions.

Balakirev, who was the leader of the 'Powerful Coterie,' known to the European public chiefly as the composer of t symphonic poem *Thamar*, or *Tamara*, which Mr. Serge Diaghil

has made popular in its ballet form. He was practically self-taught, but he had exceptional opportunities as a boy upon the estate of a famous landed proprietor and amateur of music, Oulibishev, who kept a private orchestra capable of playing the first four symphonies of Beethoven, which Balakirev at fifteen years old used to conduct. When Balakirev arrived in Petersburg in 1856, at the age of twenty-one, he fascinated everybody. Rimsky-Korsakov, who joined the 'Powerful Coterie' five years later, in 1861, has left a vivid description of Balakirev in his *My Musical Life* :

> One obeyed him without questioning, so amazing was the compelling magic of his personality. A young man with wonderfully restless eyes which flashed fire, a small neatly trimmed beard, and a peculiar incisive authoritative unvarnished way of talking—ready at any time to give a fine and technically perfect improvisation at the pianoforte, able to play everything he knew from memory, to memorise any new work after a bare hearing, he could not fail to cast a unique spell. Although he cordially recognised the smallest sign of talent in others, he could not help feeling his own superiority, which the others were quite ready to acknowledge. His influence on those around him knew no limits.

It is probable that all these young men influenced one another, but Balakirev's potency was partly due to his superior musical technique and partly to his temperament, for in actual musical genius we can hardly consider him nowadays the superior of any one of them, with the exception of César Cui, and he is certainly not to be ranked with Moussorgsky. It is difficult to assess how much Moussorgsky gained and lost by his discipleship of Balakirev. Rimsky-Korsakov gives the following account of Balakirev as a teacher :

> Balakirev, who not only had never gone through a regular course of harmony and counterpoint, but had never even touched on them, apparently did not see the necessity for such studies. A distinguished pianist, an excellent reader at sight, with an astounding power of improvisation, endowed by Nature with a feeling for correct harmony and part writing, he possessed the technique of composition in no ordinary degree : part of this was born in him, part had been acquired by his own practical experiences. Counterpoint, sense of form, a knowledge of orchestration—everything, in fact, that a composer needs—he had at his fingers' ends ; all these had been developed by an extensive course of musical reading and his extraordinary power of memory, which was faultless and unfailing. This is one of the most important foundations of sound musical criticism, and as a critic, especially of technique, Balakirev was astounding. He was aware, as if by instinct, of every technical defect, of every imperfection, however insignificant, in the form. When we youngsters played over our attempts at composition to him he would at once detect every fault in harmonisation, form, modulation, etc., and without further reflection would illustrate our mistakes on the pianoforte while he showed us how to alter—*i.e.*, to improve—the offending passage. . . .

No doubt a great deal could be learnt from such a man, but the defect of a musician with Balakirev's particular gifts is that he may not realise that men with a different kind of musical talent need instruction and training when he needed none. As Rimsky-Korsakov points out, 'as Balakirev himself had never gone through a strict course of training he denied that it was necessary for others to do so; he thought that a composer did not need any preparatory studies—all he had to do was just to compose, to create, and to get experience from his own work.' Balakirev was a perfect example of the most common and the least fruitful and important form of musical genius. It is a mark of the executive rather than the creative gift to find no technical difficulties in expression, and I should be inclined to believe that the richer and more original the creative genius, the more such a genius needed a thorough and exhaustive training. Moussorgsky, at any rate, who possessed far more creative genius than Balakirev, floundered helplessly when Balakirev found no difficulties at all. In a letter to Balakirev dated February 25, 1858, when struggling with the sonata form, he writes: 'I must confess, to my great shame, that the *allegro* is not yet ready—so I must do as you bid me, however much it goes against the grain, and write to excuse myself for having not yet finished the beastly thing.'

The year 1859 was the turning point in Moussorgsky's life. In order to devote himself to music he retired from military service in spite of the remonstrations of his friend Stassov, who quoted the example of the great poet Lermontov, who had remained an officer of the hussars until his death: 'I am not Lermontov,' said Moussorgsky; 'he, I dare say, found it possible to combine the one thing with the other, but for me it is not possible.' In this year we also get evidences of Moussorgsky's supersensitive temperament. He suffered from morbid nervous attacks which he describes as attacks of mysticism. What the exact nature of these attacks was is not made clear by von Riesemann, but Moussorgsky describes them in two letters to Balakirev. The first is dated October 19, 1859:

Dear Mili,—You reproach me with two peculiarities that you assume to be present in me. I will begin with the first, the mysticism or, as you rightly express it, the mystic strain in my nature. Two years ago, as you know, I was in the grip of a terrible illness, which attacked me with extraordinary violence while I was staying in the country. The cause of this was mysticism, aggravated by cynical thoughts about the Deity; it got much worse after I came to Petersburg. I managed to conceal it from you, but you must have noticed its effect upon my music. I suffered greatly—became fearfully sensitive—even morbidly so. Then—either as a result of distractions, or thanks to the fact that I gave myself up to fantastic reveries, which held me captive for a long time—my mysticism began gradually to disappear, and when my reason had gained the upper

hand I took steps to get rid of it altogether. I have made a great effort of late to conquer the thing, and fortunately I have succeeded. At present I have put mysticism far from me—I hope for ever, since it is incompatible with a healthy, intellectual and moral development.

The second letter is dated February 10, 1860 :

Thank God, I seem to be making some recovery from my heavy, heavy suffering, moral and physical. You remember, Mili, how two years ago we were walking down Garden Street together—you were going home—it was summertime. We had just been reading *Manfred*—I was so wildly excited by the sufferings of that lofty spirit that I cried out : ' How I wish I were Manfred ! ' I was quite a child at the time, remember ! Fate thought fit, apparently, to grant my wish—I became Manfred for the time, literally—my spirit slew my flesh ! Now I must have recourse to every kind of antidote. Dearest Mili, I know you are fond of me—then for God's sake keep a tight rein on me when we are talking together and don't let me kick over the traces ! For the time being, too, I must give up all my musical activities and avoid every kind of work that tries the brain, if I am to get better. My rule must be : ' Everything must be done for the material cure, even at the expense of the moral.' The reasons for my nervous excitability are clear to me now. It is not only the result of my illness, which was merely contributory, so to speak—the chief causes are as follows : youth, an immoderate capacity for enthusiasm, a strong unconquerable desire for omniscience, exaggerated introspection, and an idealism that even went so far as to take the dream for the reality. I see now that at the age of twenty the physical side of me is not sufficiently developed to keep pace with my forced moral growth. My illness accounts for the check in my physical development—the moral force in me has stifled it. We must come to its assistance ; distractions—get as much rest as possible—gymnastics, cold baths—these must be my salvation.

In September 1860 he writes again saying that his illness had lasted until August ; but that now ' the fire of youth has grown cold, everything has settled down—there is no more talk of mysticism . . . thank God, Mili, I have completely recovered.'

There are two interesting descriptions of Moussorgsky by Borodin which ought to be quoted here. The first gives his first impression about the end of 1856 :

There was something absolutely boyish about Moussorgsky at that time ; he was very elegant and looked like a lieutenant in a picture book ; his uniform was spick and span, his small feet were turned neatly outwards, his hair curled and scented with the utmost care ; his exquisitely manicured hands might have served as a model for a ' grand seigneur.' His manners were elegant and aristocratic, and he spoke with a slight nasal twang, employing a large number of French expressions, sometimes a little *recherché*. He was not without a touch of foppery, kept well within bounds, but unmistakable. His good breeding and courtesy were conspicuous. All

The second was in the year 1859, when Moussorgsky had left the service:

> He had grown much more manly and rather stouter in appearance: every trace of military smartness had disappeared. The distinction in his dress and manner was the same as before, but not the slightest hint of dandyism remained. . .

Borodin goes on to say that he discovered that Moussorgsky was rather contemptuous of Mendelssohn, and that he was enthusiastic over Schumann's symphonies and played some of the E flat symphony from memory; when he got to the middle movement he stopped, with the remark, 'This is when the musical mathematics begin.' He also gave Borodin on the pianoforte some idea of a scherzo for orchestra he had written, and when he came to the trio he 'hissed through his teeth: "Now here is something in the oriental style!" I was absolutely amazed at the strange new elements in his music.' This scherzo in B flat was performed in 1860 at one of the first series of symphony concerts under the direction of Anton Rubinstein. It was favourably reviewed by the famous critic Serov, who said it showed talent and compared favourably with a work in the programme of the 'famous maestro' Meyerbeer.

To have an orchestral work publicly performed under Rubinstein at the age of twenty is not a bad beginning for the career of a composer; how is it, then, that Moussorgsky's life became a complete failure from the worldly point of view, and that—to quote his biographer—'born into the high life of the aristocracy he sank, in the course of a comparatively short existence, almost to the lowest depths of the underworld'? There were many causes, but chief among them, I think, was the financial ruin of his family due to the ukase by the Tsar Alexander II. issued on February 19, 1861, liberating the serfs, which destroyed many of the lesser country estates. Owing to this disaster Moussorgsky had to take a subordinate Government clerkship, by which he barely supported himself until the last year of his life, when he resigned. His biographer suggests that it was Moussorgsky's complete lack of interest in this work which prevented him from rising in the Government service, but I doubt it. A man does not climb up the ladder of success by hard work or absorption in his duties, but because he is the climbing sort, and Moussorgsky was not. He was one of those men to whom freedom is more precious than anything else, and, since his independent character compelled him to earn his living, the only way to keep himself intact in his bread and butter occupation was to turn himself into a mere automaton during those hours. It was in these conditions that Moussorgsky composed *Boris Godounov*. Owing to the influenc

of a woman (Madame Platonova, who was to play the part of Marina) with Gedenov, the director of the Imperial theatres, *Boris Godounov* was produced on January 24, 1874, in spite of its having been rejected by the advisory committee. If *Boris* had been a success it might have saved Moussorgsky; but, although it had a great popular success, the critics damned it, and after a few performances it suffered the same fate as Pushkin's drama had originally done—it 'silently vanished from the repertoire.' Most professional musicians shared the opinion of the critics about Moussorgsky's music. Laroche complained that the composer used too frequently 'keys with many sharps or flats,' and there were complaints of *gaucherie*, coarseness, cacophony—such as original music invariably provokes. Tchaikovsky wrote in a letter to his brother on October 29, 1874: 'As for Moussorgsky's music, it can go to the devil for all I care—it is a low, vile parody of the real thing.' It is interesting that in a letter to Frau von Meck on December 24, 1877, he writes:

> You are right in thinking that Moussorgsky is done for. He is perhaps the most talented of all of them, but he is a man who has no desire to make good his own deficiencies, and is altogether too deeply impregnated with the absurd theories of his little circle, as well as by a belief in his own natural genius. He belongs, moreover, to a rather low type, which loves what is coarse, unpolished and ugly. . . . He is in love with his own lack of culture and seems to be proud of his ignorance; he writes just whatever comes into his head, with a blind belief in the infallibility of his genius. It is true that he often has very original ideas. Although the idiom he speaks is not beautiful, it is new, in spite of its vulgarities.

It is amusing that in a letter to Stassov in 1872 Moussorgsky speaks of Tchaikovsky thus:

> My dear Generalissimo,—For some days past I have been in the company of the worshipper of *absolute beauty* in music and our conversation has left me with a strange sense of an internal void. . . .

It was natural that Tchaikovsky should not have liked *Boris*, since he belonged to the opposing and rival camp, the eclectic school. But everybody expected that César Cui, an intimate friend of Moussorgsky's, and, like him, one of that national group, the 'Powerful Coterie,' would champion *Boris* and help the public and the musicians to understand it. Cui was a brilliant writer and the 'literary spokesman' for the Balakirev circle, and so his article in the *Petersburg News* was eagerly awaited. But von Riesemann says:

> The result was a big surprise for everybody and a cruel blow to Moussorgsky. Of course Cui praises *Boris*, but his praise is so interwoven with spiteful and venomous attacks on not merely the details, but the essential quality of the work as utterly to nullify his expressions of approval. . . .

Moussorgsky comments on Cui's article in a letter to Stassov dated January 28, 1874:—

My Dear and Well-beloved Generalissimo,—Yes! in spite of all!—I was mad—furious and raging like any jealous woman . . . ! Now I am only a little red and angry. What is one to say about Cui's article? I will begin at the end; no decent well-bred man would behave as Cui has done, in his efforts to be witty—it was disgraceful to make fun of women whose courageous conduct (as I have heard) deserved nothing but sympathy . . . and then to charge me with 'self-complacency'! Doesn't he know that I have always failed through excess of modesty? . . . 'Self-complacency'! 'Slap-dash way of composing!' 'Immaturity'! Who is immature, I should like to know! . . .

The failure of *Boris* doomed Moussorgsky to continue for the rest of his life in his drudgery. But it did not daunt him or stop him composing, although he was constantly complaining that his official duties delayed his work on *Khovantschina*—of which he wrote every line of the libretto as well as the music. During a short holiday in 1876 he wrote to Z. I. Shestokova:

. . . I sat on the balcony and thought about *Khovantschina* and with good results. If only I could get leave of absence my pen would simply gallop over the music paper. It is high time! Nearly everything is composed—I have only to peg away at the writing out. But my duties don't allow of it.

It is not surprising that after the production of *Boris* the 'Powerful Coterie' broke up. Borodin, in a letter dated April 1875, written to Madame Karmalina, expresses his opinion that it was the inevitable result of individual development; but it resulted in Moussorgsky becoming more completely isolated than any of the others, although for a time there were occasional meetings, mostly accidental, as, for example, that described in a letter to Stassov dated August 7, 1875:

I met the Roman (*Rimsky* in Russian means 'Roman']. We both jumped down from our droshkies and embraced with a will. Then he informs me he has written fifteen fugues, each one a greater tangle than the other—just this and nothing else!

'Oh that the ink had dried up quite
Before it helped the quill to write!'

César (I can't keep away from Rome to-day), they say, has finished the third act of *Angelo*. I have not been to see him. I am afraid—not of him, but of his third act. I did not even ask the Roman about César. When will these people, instead of writing fugues and conventional third acts, read sensible books and mix with reasonable men—or is it now too late? That is not what we expect from art to-day. That is not the mission of the artist. *Life*, wherever it is shown; *truth*, however bitter; speaking out boldly, frankly, point-blank to men, that is my only aim, that is what I want, and that is where I am afraid of making a blunder. . . .

In another letter dated October 19, 1875, Moussorgsky thanks Stassov for sending him a photograph of his portrait painted by Riepin:

I often look at you. You are gazing with strained attention into the distance, as if you scented something there. Power and knowledge of the truth speak in every feature—bravo, this Riepin! . . . It is this honest living gaze *into distances—forward*—that inspires me. When I think of certain artists who are now stuck fast 'behind the barricade' I am overcome not only with impotent wrath, but with nausea. The whole aim of these gentlemen is to express themselves, as it were, *by drops*, one drop after another, all nicely measured. They enjoy it, but a real man is wearied and enraged at it. Oh, do manage to get out of yourselves, my dear sirs, something that will show that you are alive! Show whether you have claws or web feet, whether you are beasts of prey or amphibians! . . . Without understanding, without any will of their own, these 'artists' have voluntarily allowed themselves to be bound in the fetters of tradition, they are nothing but walking examples of the law of inertia and yet they fancy they are doing great things. All this would be merely uninteresting and slightly annoying but for the fact that they—these artists—had once hoisted another banner and tried *to bear it proudly aloft before men*. Caught up in Balakirev's eagle talons they breathed the upper air for a time with him . . . now the iron grip of Balakirev has slackened—and they feel suddenly that they are tired and want a rest . . . the 'Powerful Coterie' has broken up into a horde of soulless traitors, its scourge has proved a child's toy-ship. I say that in the whole world there is nothing more deadly, nothing more useless to the art of to-day than such a set of—artists!

How deeply Moussorgsky felt his isolation is shown by the fact that he recurs to the subject in a letter to Z. I. Shestakova, the sister of Glinka, dated February 28–9, 1876:—

You have comforted me greatly with your kind, splendid letters. You are right, it is so; there *must* still be true men in the world, even though we have to suffer horridly from those who play us false—and almost everybody plays false in our glorious age, in which everything progresses—except *humanity*. . . . All that I am writing now came to my knowledge in your house; I felt it in your house. 'Truth loves not the company of liars.' There was no lying item at your house, neither on our side nor on theirs—and even the walls told no lies on that memorable evening; all was *truth*, and what truth! The gentlemen in question (Cui and Korsakov) have finally abandoned the most sacred aim of art—to speak to humanity in the language of truth. . . . I am almost sure Borodin would not have taken their side; but it is now too late to settle that, and it would do no good. *Oh, if Borodin could only get into a rage!*

Moussorgsky died 'on the morning of his forty-second birthday, March 16, 1881,' in the Nikolai Military Hospital in the Smolna suburbs of Petersburg. In order to get admission he was entered as an 'officer's servant,' but he was given a private room. Madame D. M. Leonova in her *Recollections* writes:

It is probable that two causes undermined his health: his moral sufferings (especially in connexion with the boycotting of *Boris Godounov* by the directors of the Imperial Theatre) and his material privations. He was living in terrible poverty. One day he called on me in a state of great nervous excitement; he confessed to me that he did not know what to do, that he had no means of support. . . .

Rimsky-Korsakov, in *My Musical Life*, says that Moussorgsky's illness was 'the white fever'—in other words, *delirium tremens;* and there is plenty of evidence that Moussorgsky in his later years frequently drank to excess. Von Riesemann points out that there is very little material available for a psychological biography of Moussorgsky, but it seems clear that most of his friends dropped him on account of his drinking habits. Von Riesemann says:

Moussorgsky sank ever lower in the scale of society. How high the others had risen! Stassov, Cui, Borodin were now Excellencies, Rimsky-Korsakov a professor. The gulf that had opened between them and him grew ever wider and deeper. . . .

Nevertheless, in spite of his drinking habits, Moussorgsky kept on working to the end. The first scene of the fourth act of *Khovantschina* is dated August 5, 1880, and on August 20, 1880, a few months before his death, he writes to Stassov: 'Moussorgsky is true to the principle that he has always proclaimed—with a new and unexplored path before me, am I the man to falter? Never! Forward! Full speed ahead!' He succeeded in completing *Khovantschina* in the pianoforte score, but the only pianoforte edition ever printed was that arranged from Rimsky-Korsakov's version. According to von Riesemann, Moussorgsky's original pianoforte score 'has remained till now in safe keeping in the Public Library at Petersburg awaiting its resurrection, which we hope,' he adds, 'will not be too long delayed.'

It was not my intention in the present article to discuss Moussorgsky's music. Most critics to-day are agreed that Moussorgsky is the greatest composer Russia has so far produced; but the time has not yet come for a complete estimate of his work, for the simple reason that so much of it in its original form is still inaccessible. It is worth while, however, to give one or two extracts from Moussorgsky's letters in which he says what his aims are. In a letter dated October 18, 1872, he writes:

The artistic presentment of beauty alone, to use the word in its material sense, is sheer childishness, only fit for the babes and sucklings of art. To trace *the finer characteristics of human nature* and of the mass of *mankind*, resolutely to penetrate into these unexplored regions and to conquer them—that is the mission of the genuine artist. '*To unknown shores*' must be our cry. . . .

All resolute seeking after truth inspired Moussorgsky with admiration. 'I am reading Darwin,' he says:

'and am enraptured. It is not the power and the clarity of his intellect that chains me to him—with those aspects of his colossal genius I was already familiar in his earlier works. No, it is this that holds me captive: while instructing man as to his origin Darwin understands exactly (how could he help it?) the sort of animal he has to deal with; accordingly he forces him (without his even noticing it) *into the vice-like grip of his own intellect*, and so mighty is the power of his colossal genius that the conscience not only does not struggle against this act of violence, but on the contrary is sure of nothing but joy and bliss during the process. When a strong and passionately amorous woman clasps her lover tight he is conscious that he is suffering violence; yet he has no desire whatever to free himself from the embrace, since it is the very violence that makes him 'taste the cup of rapture' and 'sets the young blood boiling.'

Moussorgsky was a realist in the best sense of that word. In spite of his intense sympathies with the Russian masses (in a letter his brother Filaret writes: 'In boyhood and youth as well as in later years my brother Modest had a special predilection for everything connected with the people and the peasantry. Even the Russian moujik was a human being in his eyes'); he never sentimentalises, and falsifies them in the fashion of some 'democratic' artists. Dostoievsky's words apply strictly to Moussorgsky: 'They call me a psychologist—that is not true; I am merely a realist in *the highest sense—i.e.*, my business is to portray *the soul of man in all its profundity*.' But contemporary musicians, in von Riesemann's words, 'raged against the "audacity," the "shameless impudence," of *Boris*.' We can understand better Moussorgsky's bitterness at the collapse of the group founded by Balakirev when we realise that Moussorgsky looked upon artists as a band of devoted fellow-seekers after truth. When Stassov went to Europe and wrote to him of his meeting with Liszt, Moussorgsky replies:

. . . you have managed, thank God, to bring the mighty form of the great European artist to my mind in living reality, to set the cells of my brain working on all he has done, to bring me near him in spirit, to let me speak to him, hear him answer. Without your help I could not have projected myself into Liszt's presence in this way and have seen him so vividly. Such a vision is vastly important—*how important I know now*, especially since he, as Bessel's brother tells me, has come to know me musically (Liszt had expressed his admiration of Moussorgsky's song-cycle *The Nursery*), though of course only in part. That was what I wanted to tell you, my friend! You may call it *pure Platonism* if you like; but the important thing is that it has stirred up my brains—which is always good for Russian brains, since every Russian (where'er he be) is like the Petersburg donkey-drivers who fall into their sweetest slumbers as soon as they

Moussorgsky certainly drank to excess and ended his life in poverty, but he never fell into those 'sweetest slumbers' which are more destructive to the artist than any form of excess.

W. J. TURNER.

A CONVERSATION AT BURLINGTON HOUSE

It was on the occasion of one of the musical *soirées* which are being held at Burlington House, presumably because all art, as one of our æsthetic writers has observed, 'naturally tends to approximate to a condition of music.' The last item on the programme had been, I remember, a toccata of Galuppi's, so charmingly and sympathetically rendered that either the music or more probably Browning's lines about it had succeeded in conjuring up for me the vision of Venice earning and spending joyously in art and song, of 'balls and masks begun at midnight, burning ever to midday.' I suppose I must have been looking at some of the Venetian pictures as well, for I found myself repeating the lines

> Dear dead women, with such hair, too—what's become of all the gold
> Used to hang and brush their bosoms ? I feel chilly and grown old,

and then suddenly I realised that the air was chilly, the music had ceased, the room was rather dark, and that I seemed to be the only person in it. For a time I imagined myself to be alone in the galleries, and was ruminating on the discomforts of a long vigil when I heard a faint murmur of voices proceeding from a distance. I assumed, therefore, that others had been accidentally shut in also, and, rising from my seat, I went in the direction of the sound. As I approached I found that the language which was being spoken was Italian, and that it came from a group of about half a dozen men who I supposed were masquerading, for they were all dressed as artists of the time of the Renaissance. I managed to approach so near as to hear part of their conversation without being myself observed. I have enough of the language to know that they had the Tuscan habit of speech, and that each, apparently, was personating a particular artist. They seemed to be having endless jokes with each other, and just before I got within earshot they had started a discussion as to which of them could paint the most horrible monster. Some had said Leonardo da Vinci could and some Piero di Cosimo, and I could tell at once which of them was taking his part, because he seemed to flush with pleasure when their choice fell on him. The sympathies of the group seemed to be pretty evenly divided, and I

heard one of them say, 'But what does Sandro think? Why, where is Sandro? He was here a moment ago and now he's gone. I want to hear what he thinks. Sandro! Sandro!' The cry rang out clearly through the empty gallery and then died away. One of them remarked that perhaps Sandro was looking at the pictures as one of the *forestieri*. Another capped this by the suggestion that perhaps at last he had gone to look for a wife. This started them all over again in a wild burst of merriment, and when the laughter had subsided I heard one of them asking another if he remembered the story that Messer Tommaso Soderini used to tell about the answer that Sandro had once made to him when he had urged him to take a wife. How Sandro had replied very gravely—he was always rather inclined to be grave, he said, so it was no wonder at all that Savonarola had got hold of him! 'I would have you to know,' he had said to Soderini, 'that not many nights since it happened to me that I dreamed I had taken a wife, and I was so greatly troubled at the thought of it that I awoke; and in order that I might not fall asleep a second time and dream it over again, I arose and wandered about all night through Florence, like one distracted. And so,' he added, 'that was how Messer Tommaso said he had come to know that Sandro Botticelli was not the sort of soil in which to plant a vineyard.' I suppose they must have heard the story before, but it seemed to please them just as much as ever, and with cries of 'Bravo, Sandro! Bravo!' they moved away to look for him. I followed them as closely as I could without their seeing me and saw them enter the Great Gallery and halt for a brief space before Botticelli's picture of *The Birth of Venus*. The somewhat dim light enhanced the effect of distance of the reaches of grey water which seemed to ripple in the wind. I fancied I could almost see the bulrushes in the foreground swaying. The goddess, even from where I stood, looked a thing of infinite beauty, and I was admiring the lovely curves of her body when the silence was broken by one of the group—a man who had hardly taken part in the previous revelry, and who from the fact of his nose being broken made me think of Michelangelo—saying, with a sardonic laugh, 'Whatever should a man who can paint that want with a wife and perhaps a pack of squalling brats?' And then I heard the one whom I had come to identify with Leonardo da Vinci, who had been as boisterous as any, but was then standing in reverie before the picture, murmur to himself, 'If you are alone, you belong entirely to yourself; if you are accompanied even by one companion, you belong only half to yourself . . . if you must have companionship, choose it from your studio. . . .' 'Well,' he went on after a pause, 'I have done as I counselled others, but I sometimes wonder whether . . .'; but as he spoke

he was following the others down the gallery, and so I lost the rest of the sentence. They hailed as Sandro Botticelli a man who, standing at some distance down the gallery, was looking with rapt attention at a rather small half-length picture of a girl in profile which, as I had been looking at it earlier in the evening, I recognised as the beautiful portrait of Giovanna Tornabuoni, by Domenico Ghirlandaio. I remembered having been struck by the proud boasting inscription on the *cartellino*—'*Ars utinam mores animumque effingere posses Pulchrior in terris nulla tabella foret.*' As they drew near he looked up, and going up to one of the older members of the group, whom I had not previously noticed, shook him impulsively by the hand, saying, 'You did not give so much of yourself to fresco, Domenico, as I thought. You have found what we have all been seeking for—you have shown us that the prime factor of beauty is repose.' At this attempt at a definition there arose what, I believe, I once saw described as a '*laudabile e scientifico duello*,' although I am doubtful whether the word 'duel' can be properly used to describe a scene in which all the actors were combatants. The voices all seemed strenuous, each being intent on definitions with some divergence of conditions. I found presently that they had passed from the attempt at definition of the characteristics of beauty, and that Leonardo da Vinci was explaining how a high standard of beauty might be obtained on the basis of natural selection by the painter selecting the best parts of faces of which the beauty was admitted and fixing these in his mind. I think it was in expounding his claim that the painter should be universal that he went on to discuss the beauty of all the changing forms of Nature, instancing specially the movement of hair and of water. He might, I think, have developed the theme had he not been interrupted by the man whom, from his broken nose, I took to be Michelangelo, who had been listening with ill-concealed impatience ever since he began and finally interjected the remark that beauty in art was no mere bubble of water or wisp of hair. Then, as Leonardo flushed angrily, he went on to say that beauty in art must be related to the human form, that supreme art demanded repose; but repose implied strength—in fact, the greater the strength, the greater the repose. As Leonardo maintained silence, another whom he had taken affectionately by the arm, and whom he called Lorenzo, turned to the doyen of the group, a short, somewhat thick-set man, who had not spoken much, and said, 'What would you say to that, Maestro?' Verrocchio—for I judge that it was he—thought for a moment before he replied, 'Not always: strength may, and sometimes does, overcome and expel repose; unless repose be dominant there is no symmetry, and without symmetry, how can there be beauty?' 'You know,'

he continued, 'it has been said of the painter that he should learn anatomy . . .' A chorus of voices rose in unison, 'Yes, of course: why you yourself, Pollaiuolo here, Leonardo, we have all learnt. Ask Leonardo how many bodies he has . . .' 'Wait,' he said, 'I had not finished; what I had meant to say was that he should learn anatomy—and forget it. Have all of us who have learnt also forgotten? And if we have not forgotten, must not strength always overcome repose?' As he said this he turned to Michelangelo as though inviting him to continue the discussion. He was just beginning to do so, but what he said was rendered inaudible by a murmur, 'Basta! Basta!' from several of the group. The next moment Piero di Cosimo, who had taken very little part in the discussion ever since they had ceased to talk about his skill in painting monsters, raised a general laugh by calling out in the sing-song tones of a public crier, 'Gentlemen! the session of the Academy of Leonardo da Vinci is ended.'

'So, it seems, you've brought your herald here from Milan.' I heard Botticelli then say to Leonardo, taking him by the arm. 'And you did have meetings in that Academy of yours? I always thought that those elaborate tickets of entry with the inscriptions must represent something, and not be merely play-time with the pen. Were they anything like our discussions in the early days at Florence? Do you remember how you protested when I stated that a sponge filled with different colours, if flung against a wall, would make a stain which would contain all the outlines of a beautiful landscape, and how you said that you would not give much for any landscape made on those lines, and that no one who really cared for landscapes could imagine that they were easy or could be done with a sponge?' I have very little doubt that Leonardo would have taken up the challenge, but there were renewed cries from the others that they had had enough of discussion. As one of them put it, art may be a battle, but it is not a battle of words. Another pointed out that they had not yet looked at the pictures, and that they had better make haste, because others might be coming in soon. After remarking how strange it was that the English, whom Benvenuto Cellini had characterised as a beastly people whom he would not wish to live among, should be so keen on Italian art—he allowed, however, that Cellini was a self-confessed liar on other counts—he further worked on the feelings of the others by a description of the English as probably at that very moment queuing up outside, and as a result they all started with much zeal to make the tour of the galleries. I followed them as closely as I could without letting myself be seen. In the first two rooms they crowded round some of the smaller pictures, and except for an occasional cavil at some attribution, put aside by the others

usually with a burst of merriment, I did not hear much of what they said. But they seemed to make rather a long pause in front of the row of small panels by Simone Martini, and I caught many exclamations of astonishment at the delicacy and grace of the figures in the two panels of *The Annunciation* and the dramatic intensity of the groups between. With them there was a small panel of *The Entombment*, the colours of which, they said, glowed like a casket of jewels. They made somewhat the same remark about a much larger picture representing the Annunciation which belonged to the Umbrian school. The base of the reading desk in this picture was a cage containing birds, and Piero di Cosimo said he thought this rather a happy idea, but did not attempt to defend his opinion when Leonardo asked him whether he thought the birds were happy in it. Several had a word of praise for the purity of line and colour of Alesso Baldovinetti's *Madonna*, others for the delicacy and grace of Pisanello's *Princess of the House of Este* and the rare fidelity of the pinks and columbines and butterflies in the background. An angel by Melozzo da Forli was for a time the cynosure of all eyes. One or two small works by Piero de' Franceschi gave rise to keen discussions in which the lists were entered in what has been termed by a modern critic the victorious struggle of planes against lines. It was Leonardo da Vinci who showed most cogently the true importance of Piero's work in the development of art, and the line regiment, if I may be pardoned the use of such an expression, seemed to be left entirely without power of reply by the lucidity of his arguments as to the nature of aerial perspective and its function in art. Their forces had a grand rally, however, before Mantegna's *St. George*: there for a time it was the other side who were struck dumb, until they finally came to agreement on the basis of recognising that art, like wisdom, was justified of her children.

It seemed, however, at one time as though the discussion might start again, for when they were in front of Correggio's wonderful picture of *Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane*, and one of them began to talk about the effect of the incidence of the light as shown emanating from the kneeling figure, Leonardo told him to think of the light from glow-worms on a bank on a summer evening, and went on to say that Nature was full of infinite causes which had never been set forth in experience.

When they reached the Venetians Giovanni Bellini's Madonnas evoked cries of admiration, among which, as it seemed, the voice of Botticelli was the loudest. These were renewed before his group of Allegories. Leonardo busied himself for some time in attempting to puzzle out their meaning: most of the others were content to regard them as feasts of colour and form. It was Verrocchio, I think, who observed that the man who could

draw the *putti* swimming around the boat which bore the standing figure of Fortune with her globe had reached the summit of achievement, and the others all agreed with him.

They stopped for some time, I remember, before Gentile Bellini's portrait of *Queen Caterina Cornaro*, and Ghirlandaio especially admired the lines of her matronly figure. They were vociferous in acclaiming the skill with which the artist has rendered the gauze that envelops the neck and shoulders, the ropes of pearls, and every tiny detail of the tightly fitting dress.

Of Giorgione's *Tempest* I heard one of them say that he had discovered a new world and established a new tradition in landscape painting. The many Titians evoked warm admiration of his great powers, the picture that attracted most attention being the portrait of an Englishman. This is, indeed, a superb example of Titian's art; but the interest of the onlookers seemed to be mainly centred in the question of the nationality of the sitter, some being disposed to regard him as a North Italian type. As they all frankly acknowledged that they had never set eyes on an Englishman, the discussion was of necessity somewhat unreal, and presently died out for lack of fuel.

They made a very long halt before *The Deposition* by Tintoretto, and Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, who had not often been in agreement, vied with each other in expressing their admiration of the way in which the painter has succeeded in rendering the pathos of the recumbent body and the emotion of the attendant figures, particularly that of the Magdalen, who is seen bending forward with arms outstretched. They all commented on how exceedingly small is the part which colour plays in the effect by contrast with the work of the other Venetians, and one of them quoted a remark attributed to Tintoretto that 'beautiful colours are bought any day upon the Rialto, but a mastery of draughtsmanship only comes to study and night watches.'

When they stood before Tiepolo's great picture of *The Finding of Moses* it was, as they said, for the purpose of looking upon Venetian art in its decline, but their unanimous verdict was that it had stood the test of years remarkably well. They thought the costumes fantastic even for the time of the Pharaohs, but were full of unstinted praise for the transparent atmospheric effects, the freedom of the landscape, and the complete individualisation of the types.

If, as it had seemed at the time, they had passed by the art of the earlier Ferrarese masters somewhat cursorily, only Cosimo Tura having attracted their attention on account of his ruggedness, they certainly made ample amends when they came to Dosso Dossi. In his wonderful portrait of a Court jester 'with the

wittol's smile,' as Leonardo admiringly characterised it, in the two versions of Circe or Alcina with her lovers turned to beasts and birds, especially in that from the Borghese, where the enchantress, richly clad, sits weaving her incantation by tracing cabalistic signs in a circle on the ground, they all recognised, as one of them expressed it, 'the well-springs of romance.' Each found something novel there to admire. With one it was the naturalism of the wooded landscape, with another the light playing on the knight's armour, with a third the boding menace of the arm that held the flaming torch. It was just at this moment that I began to hear the sound of footsteps slowly and steadily approaching from a distant gallery. To the group before the picture, silent for the moment, a-tiptoe, as it were, with expectation, it may undoubtedly have seemed that the footsteps betokened some new wile of the enchantress. Her power, they may have thought, was not confined to the magic circle! She might even have confederates! Can it have only been my fancy, or did I actually hear, as I certainly seemed to hear, the word 'Inglesi' passed rapidly from one to another, in a somewhat awestruck whisper, as they turned away from the picture and disappeared with great rapidity down one of the side galleries?

A few moments after I found myself explaining my presence as best I could to the night watchman.

EDWARD McCURDY.

JOURNALISM FIFTY YEARS AGO

To anyone who has paid attention, not merely to the big names in English literature, but to the general and progressive development of its forms and conditions, the change which came over periodicals, from 'dailies,' upward or downward, in the middle third of the nineteenth century, is, of course, a thing well known enough, though perhaps not very carefully studied in detail. It is difficult to match anywhere else, even in general quality and quantity, but more difficult still if you attempt analysis of its characteristics and attribution of its causes. In one point only does it lend itself to examination more obligingly than almost any other department, in that we have one man of letters of the first rank who exemplifies both states and was quite aware that he did so. The Thackeray of *The Snob*, the Thackeray of the earlier *Fraser*—even the Thackeray of our good Mr. *Punch* in his young days—was, as he himself fully admitted, unregenerate sometimes and frequently, though not always. He died, as fate would have it, when he was scarcely over fifty, but the Mr. Thackeray of the *Roundabout Papers* had found complete salvation in such part of the matter as he handled there. And this was not merely an example; it was a sign. For years before his death, many years more before *The Nineteenth Century* came into existence, the turn general, if not universal, had been taken in almost all subjects from politics to personal gossip. That it had already begun to turn again in some respects was only to be expected, but that does not affect what had already happened; and it is about what had already happened, with what followed, that we are to talk a little. There was the founding of the *Saturday Review* in the 'fifties; the fresh impulse given to monthly periodicals by the great success of the *Cornhill* at their close—the elevation, as we may call it, of evening papers by the *Pall Mall Gazette* and so on. It so happens that the present writer (though he had written a thing or two, chiefly for the *Academy*, earlier) did not become regularly *ascriptus* to Fleet Street till the very year before that in which the periodical in which he is now writing was founded.

The most noticeable feature of the 'change' to outsiders, especially to outsiders who were becoming insiders, was the disappearance—the almost entire disappearance—of the Mugfords and

Bludyers who abounded in Thackeray's early days and had not quite disappeared in his latest. Any tolerably clear-eyed person who made even occasional visits to Fleet Street proper—that is to say, the home of daily journalism—would meet men who might suggest that twenty years earlier Mugfordian or Bludyerian characteristics would have been more visible in them, but that was all. As for the personalities of the earlier Press, Yates and Labouchère had to some extent brought them back: but it may be a question whether this had not fenced the periodicals which did not indulge in such things more strongly against them. The curious and not always comely high jinks which had originally distinguished *Blackwood* and *Fraser* had long been given up, and *Fraser* itself was shortly to disappear. The presence of a *feuilleton* in the monthlies was no doubt maintained by the more or less accidental coexistence of three such novelists as Thackeray, the first to go; Dickens, to follow him by some years, but not with many books; and Trollope, to last longer, but not quite at full strength. There could not be two weekly periodicals more different in themselves or conjointly more significant of the desire for them than *Household Words* and the *Saturday Review*, both appearing in the earlier part of the time we are speaking of. All through the 'sixties and 'seventies the Press was constantly being delivered of new ventures, some of which naturally were, if not stillborn, exceedingly short-lived. Few attempted fresh morning dailies, the expense being enormous, and the places—places of subjects and subscribers—being in a way occupied; but some evening papers effected a lodgment. Only the two quarterlies were left alone in their glory, for though there may have been three-monthly additions, they were, I think (except the *Westminster* and the *New Quarterly*, which did not last very long), devoted to special subjects and not, like the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*, to politics and literature and things in general.

Besides what, for want of a better single word, may be called the social lift in the Press which took place in this third quarter of the century, and perhaps to some extent connected with it, there was another alteration in periodical writing. Although ever since the great increase in range and volume which the nineteenth century had seen from, and to some extent before, its very beginning, some of the producers of this volume had always been known; there had prevailed a certain atmosphere of anonymity which was thought to confer—which to some degree perhaps did confer—authority. I do not know who invented the great 'We.' You may find it in the very beginning of things in the *Spectator* group, I think, but it is there rather an association of writer and reader—an amiable admission of the latter into the proceedings and sentiments of the former. The thundering 'we,' the insinua-

tion of the existence of a formidable tribunal somewhere in the background, which issued edicts, decided cases, gave advice on future conduct—which advice had got to be followed at the follower's peril—came in later. It was almost necessary that this should be anonymous on something more than the principle of *Omne ignotum*. There might be mention of a supposed Tom Towers; intelligence more or less accurate of a real Thaddeus Delane or Albany Fonblanque, but, such a curious thing is the human mind, it was the uncertainty more than the certainty that loaded the cartridge.

By degrees, however—and especially as a kind of disrepute wore off Pressmen—there began to be, more particularly in non-political writing, a desire for signed articles. It was, I think, much more the curiosity of the public than the vanity of the journalist that gave impetus to this change. For my own part, when, after an early undergraduate letter to a local paper about the Athanasian Creed, I began, as late as seven and twenty, to be something like a regular contributor, it was, as I have said, to the new *Academy*, founded directly and deliberately to give the signed article a chance, and my first article of any length was one on Baudelaire, which I sent unintroduced to the late Lord (then only Mr. John) Morley, and which he promptly took.

The periodical in which this appeared—the '*Fortnightly*, published monthly,' as a wit who had to speak the name officially in the proceedings of a newly founded club in the Channel Islands persisted in announcing it—was another great stronghold of 'signing,' though, if I am not mistaken, Morley long afterwards confessed doubts on this point. There is no doubt that anonymity has had, on the whole, the worst of it since, though the citadel of the 'leader' has, in very important cases, not even yet yielded. For my own part, though I might be thought from what I have just said, and out of pure gratitude, likely to be prejudiced in favour of signing, that is not exactly the case. As far as gratitude or even custom goes, I am 'prejudiced' both ways. If I have written hundreds of signed articles, I have written thousands of unsigned; and there cannot be many people living who know the advantages and disadvantages of both plans by experience better than I do. Largely, no doubt, but by no means wholly, the thing depends upon subject: though even here the pros and cons insist upon being attended to. In politics—to begin with them—things are so much dependent, and should be so much dependent, on the general attitude of the paper that identification never can do much good, and may do some harm. If we ever fell into the *cartel* or *bloc* or general minor party system (which God forbid!), there might be more argument for it; but with the old two, or even with the present three parties, it seems superfluous,

if not mischievous, as far as *daily* papers go. In the greatest (I am speaking in terms of bulk) of the other subjects—that is to say, literature—it was the signing system that first made head, the signing system that created most interest, and the signing system that has made most way. Here, as elsewhere, I have written an almost disgraceful number of both kinds. I have confessed elsewhere to having written five reviews—I think it was five—of the same book, though I can quite fearlessly add that I should not blush if all five were reprinted side by side. It is, however, of course rather desirable that such a thing should not be done, and the anonymous system, also of course, helps the doing of it. If, as Harwood of the *Saturday* once said to me, the reviews are favourable, it is unfair to the public, if unfavourable to the author.

I have sometimes thought that a good deal, perhaps even a great deal, of the causation of the change in periodicals between the 'fifties and the 'seventies, though of course nothing like the whole, depended on a certain closer connexion between the Press and the two universities. Of course once more, and inevitably from the very beginning, the dramatists and pamphleteers had been university men and certainly would have been what we call Pressmen later. And, as periodical literature came more and more fully into existence, they were. Defoe was not a son of the 'sisters,' vocal or silent, but Lestrange probably, Addison, Steele, and Swift certainly were. Between none of these, however, and either Oxford or Cambridge or Dublin is there much obvious connexion to be seen in or derived from their Press work. The *Spectator* certainly was not written in Addison's *Walk*, though we may think of it there; and I do not think the walls of Merton, if they had been the most absorbent and retentive of their kind in noticing, could have told me much that was literary about Steele. I fancy that we are rather too apt to take on trust the abuse of the universities in the eighteenth century: but it was certainly not till its close that men of letters of mark took to journalism, and though they may have been Oxonians or Cantabs, neither *Alma Mater* has left much mark of that on them as such, unless we call Johnson a journalist. Southey was a Balliol man and Coleridge a Jesus of Cambridge, but Southey admits that Oxford made very little impression on him, and Coleridge gave his university little chance of making any impression at all except in the production of prize poems. As for Wordsworth, Heaven help the editor who had him on his staff! As you go on, neither Hazlitt nor Lamb nor Leigh Hunt was a university man; and though Wilson and De Quincey were, they show little of it. Barnes of *The Times* was; but he died almost before any signs of change showed themselves.

On the other hand, each of the three decades of which we have been chiefly speaking saw a closer, though a peculiar, connexion between Fleet Street (speaking collectively as before) and the two old seats of learning.

At the time when Thackeray himself was at Cambridge, the Press, with rare exceptions, had not emerged from its rather incult conditions, and when he had himself acquired cultivation in periodical writing he had little to do with Cambridge. Except the 'Timbuctoo' piece, almost the whole of *The Snob* is not above schoolboy level: more than one or two of the *Fraser* articles required an editor of the Oliver Yorke stamp to save them from heavy blue-pencilling. But as the century approached its middle, and with increasing noteworthiness during its third quarter, things altered. It was not so much that more and more newspaper men had passed through one or other of the two, though the great Tom Towers or Thaddeus Delane was actually a Magdalen Hall man. Speaking as a voice from the very middle (1863–7) of the longer period, I can vouch for the existence of a rather curious and complicated connexion. It was not merely that many dons resident, and more who had 'gone down,' wrote for all sorts of papers, but that Press work had become, if not exactly an additional profession which men could add to their old options, but, still more, a most convenient preparation of law, physic and divinity time, and almost apprenticeship, to those professions themselves. Not a few men of letters have actually confessed that the famous chapters of *Pendennis* which tell how Warrington taught his pupil to supplement his last five-pound note were their own incitement to Press work; and a great many more than have ever confessed it might, I think, have done so on the actual banks of Isis and Cam in those days. Warrington, it is true, might never have taken to Press work had it not been for his marital misfortunes, nor Pen but for his silly extravagance. But that has little to do with the matter. If they had not belonged to the same College, it is doubtful whether belonging to the same Inn would have fastened them so easily or so tightly together.

It is well, and indeed important, to remember that during the 'seventies, and also, though in dwindling fashion, during the 'eighties, some very big guns, though they had taken the field long before, continued to hold it. Carlyle did not die till 1881, but he had long ceased to write anything but things unpublishable till his death, not that they were in the least discreditable or unfair to anyone but himself. Mr. Gladstone's greatest speeches, as even the more critical of his closest adherents admitted, were much better to hear than to read, and so not first-rate printstuff. But Tennyson did not disdain periodical appearance; and I

confess that, frequently as Matthew Arnold wrote things which I disagreed with, or which, to be humbler, disagreed with me as literature, and almost invariably as they did so when he took to theology, I should have felt it my duty to my proprietor to resign editorship rather than refuse Matthew's articles. Leslie Stephen was a tower of strength in literature, as you felt in more ways than one; and so was Huxley in science, to mention only super-super writers.

For newcomers the extension in number and character of the range of the new periodicals was a considerable advantage. It is true there were some—perhaps extra-virtuous, perhaps something else—who would contribute to no journal not merely which said anything they did not like, but which even let anyone else do so. I believe, though I did not hear it said myself, that a journalist of those days laid it down that he would never help the sale of any paper with the general policy of which he did not agree. Had the thing been put as a joke it would not have been bad; and it can be argued for more solemnly on the principle that a man should always have his employer's prosperity at heart. But the facetious side, meant or not (and this certainly was *not*), presents itself first and holds its place obstinately. The multiplication, therefore, of papers, and the fact that many of the new ones had no definite and carefully adjusted *credo*, was a distinct advantage.

It would, of course, be improper to make any impertinent comparison here between the journalist of the eighteen-seventies and the journalist of the twenty-thirties. I saw, indeed, only a few hours before writing these lines, an observation which of itself settled this point. The author was not one of those who blackwash the Victorians—indeed he rebuked the persons who did so. But one of the reasons for which he rebuked them was 'our'—that is to say, 'his and his contemporaries'—'immense advance in actual knowledge and critical subtlety.' There was, of course, an excellent sense of justice in this, and the writer of it should make an admirable handicapper. It is true that one might ask for particulars. Do mechanical gadgets and contraptions help to bulk—perhaps to compose—the 'immense advance of actual knowledge'? Does the increase of subtlety in criticism depend at all on the novel use of such terms as 'values,' 'inhibitions,' 'mentality'? But this is quite out of our range. You can but do your best with such knowledge as you have and such subtlety as Providence has provided you with. The novel, though still a very large contributor to periodicals, was somewhat weakening in strength. Thackeray and Dickens were dead, and Charles Kingsley had more recently followed them. His brother Henry, still writing, was soon to follow him. Trollope and

Wilkie Collins had done their best work and Hardy had scarcely begun his. Nobody had in any way or to any degree continued the *Roundabout Papers* in essay-writing. In poetry Mr. Austin Dobson was positively reviving the lighter style: but in the meantime Mr. Bridges was publishing little and was not generally understood, while comparatively popular verse-makers like Lewis Morris and Alfred Austin were making true lovers of more serious poesy laugh or weep or curse, according to their owner's dispositions and the particular achievement of these verse-makers. The *Spectator* was still, as one of its admirers said, 'telling you what you ought to read,' and the *Saturday* was still endeavouring to tell you how you ought not to write; while a third 'weekly'—once of no small name, the *Examiner*—was dying, despite of having had the luck to find such a proprietor as Lord Rosebery.

So, for all the immense shortcoming in actual knowledge, for all the lack of subtlety in criticism, I do not think that the journalism of that time was destitute of values or that it always failed to show a remarkable mentality. If it is true that, as the books say, Delane helped to prevent our interfering with that first affair in 1864 which led up to, and, it would be rash to say, ended in, 1914 or 1918, it was Greenwood who brought about that hold on Egypt the various results of which we have not yet quite thrown away. I doubt whether in the history of journalism you will find a group of three illustrating its powers and possibilities in different ways more notably than H. D. Traill, Andrew Lang, and Edmund Gosse—all of whom entered the (may we call it?) profession between forty and sixty years ago. Traill for weight and 'Punch' Lang for variety and grace; Gosse for lightness—they would be pretty hard, I will not say to equal, but to beat, in any company and in any times.

Now, near the end of the first third of the twentieth century I seem to notice that it is rather the 'eighties than the 'seventies which are regarded as the distinctest part of 'yesterday,' and perhaps politically there is no great difficulty in accepting this or at least accounting for it. It looked as if Shooting Niagara had not done so very much after all, and though some of the greater names of the first half of the century had been written off, not a few remained. But at the time no sense of age and no spirit of revolt had come on literature. The very selection of the title of this periodical itself would be enough to prove this, and I do not remember that there was any kind of atmosphere as of 'beginning' about or seeming to be about. If the Turks had not obliged Mr. Gladstone by cutting Bulgarian throats to an extravagant extent, there is no knowing what might have happened or not have happened. But the Turks

did oblige; and the Irish, in their complicated Hibernian way, obliged likewise; and Tennyson and Browning and Carlyle died, and the novel ceased to be a three-decker; and after something like a century play-writing seemed to be possible again in England.

The dying off or foundering of the three-decker had, by the way, one malignant effect which was left out of Mr. Kipling's beautiful poem on its disappearance. While it lasted it added very considerably to the profits of those Pressmen who had to do with it. Mr. Bludyer, it may be remembered, was in the habit, after a piratical or petty-larcenous fashion, of laying hands upon books in newspaper offices, of reading them after a fashion, selling them at second-hand bookshops, and, after knocking off a notice, dining on their price. The indecencies of this process were manifold and obvious. He ought to have waited till the books were sent to him, or at least to have chosen them under the eye and with the leave of an authority. He ought to have completed the reading and the writing *before* he sold them. And we ought to be assured that he had any right to sell them at all. For among the many minor differences between papers in those days this was not the least. There were some, and of the best, where the books reviewed had to be returned to the editor as a matter of course, and a very considerable addition to his salary a whole year's book-selling must have made; while if he was a very conscientious man, the paper, by judicious selection, acquired a very useful modern library. On the other system, books of any definite value reviewers who were not very hard up, of course, kept. But a novel in the three-volume form took a great deal of room, was clumsy to re-read for pleasure, and if it was really any good was sure to be quickly reprinted in a less cumbrous and more manageable and useful form. Circulating libraries, then more numerous than now, were eager to have, and consequently the second-hand bookshops to buy, the first issues. I do not know, and I do not think that there was any fixed ratio of price to the guinea and a half of that issue. But you did not get as much in proportion for one- or even two-volume books as you did for the authentic 'old three-decker,' though it was a fluent and not entirely baseless sneer that nobody read the second 'vol.' There was an air of respectability about it. Let us also hope that there was nothing disreputable in the entries that occur sometimes in old account-books of six, seven, or even ten pounds for batches of new-old novels!

There is a point about the great expansion of periodicals and the consequent multiplication of 'journalists' in the wide sense—very wide, for it is still thought good to indulge in the pleonasm *daily* journal and more often in the contradictions 'weekly,'

'monthly,' and even 'quarterly' journal—which may have interest for some readers. Whence and how did the journalists of these journals come? Of comparatively late years I have seen and heard of schools and institutes of journalism, and even of parts of it, such as short stories. I have also seen some most respectable names connected with these academies, but the matter has always been a sort of puzzle to me. On the one hand, I myself have had no small experience of teaching—eight years as a schoolmaster and twenty as a professor. On the other, I have had still longer experience of practical journalism of almost every kind. Further, nobody will be surprised if I tell them that during the two decades in which I held the chair of Rhetoric and English Literature at Edinburgh—one of the nearest to a chair of Journalism itself (if such a thing may be) outside the Classics—I was again and again besought to tell students how to get posts on papers. I had but one answer: 'Send something somewhere and try.' It might not seem very obliging—it might even seem a really disobliging refusal to tell secrets which had obtained profit for oneself, but of which one was not now making much use for that self. But I am pretty sure that it is the best answer—the only answer—that is wise and safe.

Of course, there are some people whom no teaching, no patterning will help. I did not need to tell my students to read good examples; few of them were absolute idiots. I may have told elsewhere the sad but true story of one catastrophe which was told me by the editor concerned. He had on his staff a man who contributed frequently, if not regularly, articles on one of those artistic or scientific subjects which can be handled at leisure at home, and when printed can be sent in proof to the writer to wait any convenient season of insertion. The man was also a personal friend. He took it into his head to become, if not a regular leader-writer, at least an occasional writer of regular leaders in the witching hours of night, before the House of Commons had agreed to pay itself for working according to the great new principles of the twentieth century: 'The less work, the more pay'—when foreign or distant home news came in, not by telegram or telephone, but by horse-expresses and so forth. Now, the editor, though a very good fellow and a good friend of this ambitious one, was not going to have tricks played with his paper, and had a shrewd suspicion that his friend might not be quite up to the task he sought. So for a considerable time he put the aspirant off less or more seriously. At last, of course, what happened in the case of the Unjust Judge and other people happened with him. So it was arranged that the urgent novice should come down at the sacred hour of ten o'clock, should have a subject of the day given him and try his

hand on it. He came, was given his subject—a quite genuine one, but, of course, one which would not be missed if it did not appear next morning, and dismissed to a room by himself, luxury which one did not always enjoy in those days. No 'copy' came down or went up, and, of course, no article appeared next morning. The editor equally of course, had not been undignified or ill-natured enough to investigate what was going on between ten and midnight when the contributor had departed (to make the inevitable variety-parallel) in despair and a hansom. But later things came out to the expected extent. He had begun over and over again, had sometimes found the 'subject' slipping away from him; sometimes that neither on that subject nor any other could *he* find anything to say worth saying.

Of course it may be said, 'Well! first attempt. He'd have done all right, or at least better, with practice.' I rather doubt it. Practice might have supplied him with one of those dreadful first paragraphs which we all know so well, and which a wicked sub-editor once told me he always transposed to third because people were less likely to read them, and because they were as good or as bad in one place as in the other.

With another misfit of the same kind I was once brought into still closer contact. When I was making my usual visit to my editor, another young man (I was young then) came out as I went in. After a sort of sigh—half of relief and half to allow sufficient time for the outsider to get a little away from the door—our commanding officer said, 'Did you look at him? He is one of the plagues of my life. He is a very good fellow: and his people are very good friends of mine. But somehow the "subjects" I give him generally don't suit *him*, and the articles he gives me don't suit *me*.'

I have known some arguments about 'recommendations'—arguments the results of which affected my own replies to students as above. I once, in my own earliest days of London work, sent, at about the same time, three articles, two of these at least strongly backed up by recommendations. The first was rejected because the editor did not agree with its opinions (they had nothing to do with politics). The second was rejected because this editor did not think the public would care for its subject. The principle of this latter rejection was, of course, quite sound, but the application might seem odd till you knew and considered the circumstances. For this subject was Dryden; and the public—at least the publishers and others—were so far from disliking it that this rejected paper formed the nucleus of some lectures; and was followed by a complete reissue of Scott's edition, a book in Macmillan's 'English Men of Letters,' and a further edition of selected plays in Nimmo's collection, with articles innumerable.

Of course the other people who would have liked to do simi things themselves found fault with these, but that is a matter course, and, besides, does not in the least affect the question of importance of a first rejection. What became of the third vent I do not clearly remember, but I think it was not recommen and was accepted.

No doubt chance, as everywhere, has a great deal to do w the matter, as well as things that can hardly be called chan My Dryden-rejector was a man nearly as old as his century, so representing in point of taste the first generation of the ni teenth, with most of whom Dryden was paying the penalty his supremacy in the late seventeenth, and his scarcely lessen though then shared, esteem in the eighteenth. The tide was j turning, and what I have said will show that I was to get the f advantage of it; but that turn in my editor's case had actually come.

Unless one has an old head and a wise one—for age is not invariably connected with 'visdom' as, according to a gr authority, 'vidth' is—things of this kind do not invariably occ to one, while there are others which cannot well do so. editor has a file full of articles on the subject you have take rejection almost certain unless yours is extraordinarily a strikingly good. He has nothing, or nothing good, on a subject wants at once: acceptance most probable if the postulant any merit at all. I cannot say that I have many rejections record, and I can say that I never sent an article on second tri though I may have occasionally have used in other articles in books, whose salvation was already assured, passages whi had experienced damnation earlier. To make proposals a seco time does not suit my taste, and, though in this case it is n the same person who is proposed to, there remains, if only kno to itself, a certain smirch on a rejected face.

To conclude, despite the immense advance of the present tir in knowledge and in subtlety, I fancy that journalism to-day much less changed from journalism fifty years ago than t latter was from journalism not merely fifty but thirty ye before; and this fancy is not merely grounded on a conte poraneousness which cannot last more than a year or two a may not last more than an hour or a minute. I have always h rather a fondness for looking at things in general, especia literary things, *horizontally*.

George Saintsbury.